

HISTORY

Paper 9769/11
British History Outlines, c. 300–1547

Key messages

- Make sure that you know the key concepts relevant to the period.
- Read the question carefully and think about its implications.
- Write clearly and legibly using ball point pen.
- Make sure that the information which you include is relevant to the question.
- Give the historian's name when describing their argument.

General comments

There was much detailed and relevant knowledge and argument. Many answers reflected an obvious enthusiasm for the topics and there were many confident judgements offered. The standard of communication was often high with good use of historical vocabulary and some varied and nuanced writing.

Regarding presentation, however, all examiners commented on the increasing problem of illegibility. In some cases, this was so severe that the meaning of some paragraphs was obscured. It is a huge pity when work is compromised as the reader cannot follow the flow of argument and explanation. Regarding the appropriate writing tool, it is a Cambridge International Examinations requirement that candidates use a ballpoint pen. Fountain or roller ball type pens can cause the ink to 'bleed through' the examination booklet paper therefore making writing illegible. Candidates should understand that poor handwriting can make their work difficult, and in some cases impossible, to read.

In terms of academic performance, the main distinction was at the higher end of the mark range between those answers in which an attempt was made to offer sustained and supported judgements in response to the question and those in which a series of supported explanations was presented. Often the quality of the explanations was high but the evaluative essence of questions like 'What best explains...', 'To what extent' or 'How far do you agree...' was not addressed. The different factors were often identified clearly at the start, then explained (with various degrees of support in what was often a structured answer) then reprised in the final paragraph. This did not demonstrate the higher level analytical skills required for the higher mark bands. At the lower end of the mark range, the material deployed was not always used in support of arguments but more for its own sake and the explanations were more like assertions. Better answers saw the implications of the question and took the concept as the starting point then discussed the criteria for success, the extent of success and offered an overview. Weaker responses started with different elements of the reign or different aspects of policy, set them out and then offered a comment on whether they were successful or not. This approach took weaker answers further and further away from the exact terms of the question. For example, analyses of what explained why Lord Liverpool was in office for so long which did not focus on the key concept of the longevity of his ministries soon became answers to a question that had not actually been asked (such as 'how successful were the policies of Liverpool' or 'how well did he deal with the radical threat'). These answers were written without sufficient thought to the exact question which had been asked. Reliance on prepared answers is a dangerous examination strategy especially where the answer is also factually incorrect, or contains misunderstandings. When answering questions on the Elizabethan Parliament or the Puritans making reference to historians can be illuminating and helpful, but candidates should avoid making references to works written many years ago. Modern historians now consider these past debates irrelevant. For questions on historical issues before 1800 that involved the Whigs, candidates should be sure to describe the Whig view. However, there is a tendency to assume that there is a Whig view of every historical issue before 1800 and this should be discouraged.

When approaching questions, candidates should aim to discuss the main factor first. For example, if a question asks 'How important was Lord Salisbury in maintaining Conservative supremacy ...' there should be substantial consideration of his leadership in the first two, or possibly three pages.

Lastly, candidates should show understanding of the key concepts relevant to the period being studied and know the required specialist vocabulary (which is not extensive). For example, they should understand the different aspects between 'domestic' and 'foreign' policies. Those candidates who have studied the history of the Labour party should also know what is meant by 'socialism', particular in the context of the Labour ministries of 1945 to 1951.

Some key elements of candidates' responses were very successful. Firstly, most candidates offered three full essays and used their time well. Final responses were not generally weak nor appeared rushed. Though, in comparison with the first two essays attempted, naturally many candidates often did their best answer first. Secondly, answers were generally clearly structured and easy to follow. Thirdly, the quality and variety of language was often high with many telling phrases and clear explanations. Finally, knowledge was often more than adequate with some good detail.

The following comments are offered on questions where there were enough answers to make general trends apparent. It is a pity that there is a relative lack of answers to questions in the Themes sections, but there was a range of questions attempted.

Comments on specific questions

- 1 Candidates tended to see the rulers of Roman Britain as being represented by the central imperial government rather than taking a local perspective in terms of the provincial governors and local senatorial aristocracy. As a result, the answers tended to focus on geographical and military factors, pointing out how peripheral Britain was in the Roman Empire and how the increasing military crises that afflicted the Empire drew soldiers away from Britain. There were some comments on the lack of effective leadership. Most answers when they went into specifics discussed the early 5th century in a manner more appropriate to questions on the end of Roman Britain. There was discussion of the Gothic military crisis, but this was not related to the situation of the 370s as the discussions were more relevant to the crisis created by Alaric in Italy which only began to occur around 402 onwards, culminating in the sack of Rome in 410. (Several candidates mentioned this, along with the Honorius letter to Britain which is usually interpreted as occurring in the same crisis and thus not strictly relevant.) Responses might have discussed the continual usurpations and the evidence of increasing economic problems from the mid-fourth century onwards.
- 2 There were some strong answers which focused on geographical factors such as the impact of climate change in the fifth century which rendered northern Europe increasingly inhospitable, the end of Roman control of Britain and its consequent military and political weaknesses which encouraged Anglo-Saxon mercenaries to make careers in Britain. Weaker answers needed a more precise focus on the question and tended to explain why there was an Anglo-Saxon migration in general terms, rather than why 'England' was so attractive during this specific period of time.
- 3 Candidates were able to discuss East Anglia and Kent with some confidence, identifying Raedwald and Aethelbert as demonstrating power through their ability to exert political influence across other kingdoms. Sutton Hoo and the Roman mission of Augustine were typically used to demonstrate these kingdoms' political influence. Essex was cited as the opposite example of kingdoms lacking power, and some candidates were able to discuss the evidence of Mucking to demonstrate there was some wealth in these kingdoms. The main issue was that there was not enough focused definition of 'power' to allow a relative discussion, and the main focus of the evidence was restricted to the early seventh century and so the essays failed to cover the whole time frame.
- 4 Candidates were able to show they had a good knowledge of the main figures of the Northumbrian kings of their hegemonic period, and Aethelfrith, Edwin, Oswald and Oswiu were all discussed. The main themes of answers was the relative ability of all these kings as war leaders, though the main focus tended to be on Oswald and Oswiu, and there was less discussion of Aethelfrith which was unfortunate. Several answers compared the Northumbrian rulers with Penda of Mercia, which was fine except some answers wrote more on this relative comparison than was strictly required. There was some discussion of the political ability demonstrated by Oswiu in managing the Synod of Whitby. On the whole, though, essays were more focused on character than focused directly on the question of ability which left some answers unbalanced. There was not much discussion of how far the kings' characters could actually be accurately reconstructed given historians' reliance on the work of Bede.

- 6** Candidates answering this question tended to rather critical of Wilfrid after the Synod of Whitby, arguing that his contribution to the consolidation of Christianity was undermined by his lavish lifestyle and arrogant personality. Candidates emphasised his failure to encourage institutional development within the Church. There was not a large amount of discussion of his encouragement of monastic influence, his church building or his missionary work in Sussex. Most candidates were far more informed about Theodore of Canterbury, whose role was usually praised as being much more significant through his organisation of a structured diocesan system and his promotion of education. Some candidates also discussed the role of other individuals such as Benedict Biscop and Ecgbert. Overall answers could have been more focused on Wilfrid's role.
- 7** Candidates answering this question focused on the contribution of Bede and there was some discussion of the Franks casket, though its Northumbrian provenance is assumed rather than confirmed. Generally, the answers did not engage with the implied argument in the question by attempting to balance out the role of the individual against the wider institutional and cultural context of the Northumbrian Golden Age.
- 8** Candidates answering this question showed a good grasp of the different aspects of Offa's rule, as there was discussion of issues such as coinage, Offa's Dyke, the Church, relations with Charlemagne and the Carolingian Empire as well as Offa's diplomatic skills. Alongside this was a good grasp of Offa's military career and how this underpinned his power, with some candidates broadening this aspect of the discussion further than simply his campaigns against Wessex, Kent and Sussex by showing that Offa's Dyke was evidence for a military focus, albeit also showing the capacity to mobilise significant resources which implies a more significant ruler. The main issue affecting some answers was that they discussed what Offa did rather than explain how his actions demonstrated his abilities.
- 13** There were strong answers which laid down some criteria for judging 'well ruled' and offered assessment about how far the reign met these. They often concluded that, despite the King being under the thumb of the Godwins, the country did not suffer as administration continued and law and order were maintained. They were able to develop alternative arguments drawn from the events of 1050–1052 where some instability was seen as showing that the country was not been well ruled. Some of the strongest answers considered how far the problems of the succession to Edward could be seen as evidence for his rule not being sound. Weaker answers would have benefited from greater focus on the demand of the question. Some considered alternative issues such as how strong Edward was or how much power was exercised by the Godwins.
- 14** Stronger answers were able to focus on 'consistent' and there was some nuanced argument suggesting that William did not intend to be brutal all the time as this was counter-productive. Such responses pointed out that as the leader of a minority William needed to strike a balance between force and persuasion. To support such arguments, there was some sound analysis of his response to rebellions. Good responses also considered how far William's replacement of the ruling English elite with Normans could be seen as brutal and some looked at castle-building in the same light. On this basis, most concluded that he was not brutal all the time. Some weaker answers did not recognise that there was more to this question than the simple issue of brutality. Hence, to prove their point, they considered how far William I was brutal, or gave a narrative of events with detailed descriptions of the Harrying of the North. Some of these, however, qualified their argument to a degree by suggesting that the disloyalty of the English perhaps justified some of William's more vigorous reactions.
- 15** This was a popular question and most answers showed sound knowledge of the events of the reign. Stronger answers recognised that a bad man was not necessarily a bad medieval king and showed that a reputation for strong government and a robust attitude to plotters and opponents, preserved law and order and so was the attribute of a good ruler. Better answers were able to use William's quarrel with Anselm to show that he had some right on his side and that the rest of the Church was supportive of his viewpoint, while weaker answers suggested that his persecution of the saintly archbishop was enough to characterise him as an evil monarch and thus a bad king. Some of the best work analysed the value of Eadmer as one of the main sources for these events. Weaker answers were often quite assertive, outlining an issue and then stating that it showed William was, or was not, a bad king.

- 22** There were few good answers to this question, as often they did not target the issues about why the Civil War lasted so long but focused on the underlying reasons. Some candidates began by explaining the reasons for war quite usefully and the problems with Matilda's claim, but then were unable to develop the answer further and their answers often became descriptive. Others spent some time considering the legacy of Henry I and baronial discontent, and barely mentioned the succession problem. Better answers suggested that the fact that the War ended when the succession was settled, indicated that it was the root cause of the War, and often argued that the barons, Geoffrey de Mandeville in particular, exploited the succession difficulties for their own ends. Very few answers addressed 'merely', but some questioned how far such a destructive war could be categorised accurately in that way, or argued that the succession was far too vital an issue to be dismissed so lightly.
- 23** Better answers considered the challenges of governing lands from the Pyrenees to the Scottish borders, but argued that Henry II's peripatetic court, his delegation to trusted deputies, including his wife, and his raising of revenue to fund his armies, worked well until he encountered family troubles. Thus, such responses concluded that it was not inherently the size but the other issues which caused the problems. Some also mentioned the reviving power of the Capetians. While the size of the Angevin Empire is often cited as a reason for the problems its rulers faced, many weaker answers to this question were not able to provide an adequate discussion of this factor. They moved on rapidly to other explanations and hence could not access the higher mark bands. Some did not consider the issues over how Henry II proposed to provide for his sons, many of which arose from the size of the Empire, and the difficulties that these raised for Henry in maintaining his position.
- 24** Most answers agreed with the statement in the question, although the point that Richard was out of England for a much longer period than he was in the country was not the best argument put forward in support. Better answers were able to contrast Richard's obsession with the raising of funds (either for the Crusade or to finance his reconquest of the lands taken by Philip Augustus) which dominated his periods in England, with the government provided by Hubert Walter. But some stronger answers also suggested that Richard made sensible provision for his absence and took care to neutralise his brother John, as he thought. In addition on his return, it was argued, he sent out fresh instructions to the justices. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive and some diverted into how Richard governed his French territories, which was irrelevant to this question.
- 35** There were plenty of answers to this question and most displayed sound knowledge. Some of the better answers began with the premise that Edward was overthrown in 1470 and used this as a measure of his lack of success. Some of these argued cogently that most of his policies in various ways exacerbated opposition, so that, for example, success in raising taxes could be counter-productive if it alienated tax-payers and so made them likely to join in rebellion. One or two good answers used the terms of the appeal made by Warwick when he invaded from Calais as an indictment of Edward's government. Other stronger answers suggested that Warwick would never have been appeased and so Edward was bound to fail in maintaining his position, almost regardless of his success in other areas. Weaker responses were frequently descriptive and showed how Edward overcame the problems he faced, rather than assess how successfully he did so. Such answers outlined his efforts against the lingering Lancastrian opposition, but did not evaluate the degree of his achievements. Other less strong answers concentrated on the Woodville marriage to the exclusion of almost all other factors, and so were seriously imbalanced.
- 36** There were not many answers to this question and they were rarely strong responses. They mostly described the policies of the kings and then drew conclusions in the final paragraph. Relations with France were the main focus of these answers. Better responses recognised that the relative weakness of England meant that foreign policy was dictated more by the attitudes of the other countries. Hence, they suggested that Louis XI used England as a weapon in his rivalry with Burgundy and this formed one of the consistencies. Another was the generally hostile relationship with Scotland. Financial constraints on policy were identified as another good answer. Some of the weaker responses took the view that Richard III had no time to develop a foreign policy, and overlooked his crucial failure to get the French to surrender Henry Tudor. The less developed responses saw foreign policy in quite general terms in order to find consistency, or sometimes did not address this focus in the question.

- 38** This was a popular question and candidates showed much sound knowledge. Better answers identified the problems Henry faced before assessing his ability in solving them. Some of these stressed his inexperience and so argued that his success owed a good deal to his ability in choosing advisers wisely and following a carrot and stick policy. Analysis of the difficulties in his later years argued that it was circumstances, rather than a lack of ability, which led to these problems. Weaker answers had problems in selecting relevant and convincing material. Some of these went into much detail about the pretenders, rather than analysing how Henry's dealings with Simnel and Warbeck displayed his ability or lack of it. Similarly, less strong arguments centred on the methods Henry used in government, finance and dealing with the nobles, without examining how far these revealed his ability. With unconvincing evidence and sparse arguments, some weak answers maintained that Henry had no ability at all and died to general acclaim after a miserly and autocratic reign.
- 39** Virtually all responses realised that it was necessary to define 'the interests of Henry VIII'. Better responses suggested that the raising of sufficient revenue, the preservation of law and order, the maintenance of royal authority and the pursuit of foreign glory were all in the interests of the monarch. Some answers argued that Wolsey pursued his own interests more than those of Henry VIII as a way to show that he was not effective, while others made a counter-argument from his apparent failures. Either approach was acceptable. Weaker answers described his policies and often became enmeshed in detail, so that a clear judgement was never reached. Stronger work took the line that Wolsey knew only too well that royal interests must prevail and that his government was entirely geared to this end. His lack of effectiveness was soundly assessed by such answers. Responses needed to show an accurate understanding of the subsidy, the Chancery and the Star Chamber, but this was not always evident.
- 41** There were many answers to this question which did not address its terms precisely. The question was asking 'why was the reign unsettled', not how unsettled it was. Thus responses which challenged the term 'unsettled' were not able to achieve within the higher mark bands. Some weaker responses instead of discussing the troubles under Somerset concentrated on the achievements of Northumberland. Other weaker responses omitted the religious issues, some suggesting that religion was not a problem in this period and some, within the context of the reign, explored the legacy of Henry VIII as a major cause of instability. Long accounts of the events of the early 1540s and the problems with Henry VIII's legacy detracted from the focus of the question. Better responses analysed how far the rule of a minor, foreign entanglements, social and economic difficulties, religious uncertainty and problems over the succession led to instability. However, they did not always argue how these were reasons for the 'unsettled' nature of the reign. Answers needed a clearer understanding of what made an unstable government in mid-Tudor England.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/12
British History Outlines, 1399–1815

Key messages

- Make sure that you know the key concepts relevant to the period.
- Read the question carefully and think about its implications.
- Write clearly and legibly using ball point pen.
- Make sure that the information which you include is relevant to the question.
- Give the historian's name when describing their argument.

General comments

There was much detailed and relevant knowledge and argument. Many answers reflected an obvious enthusiasm for the topics and there were many confident judgements offered. The standard of communication was often high with good use of historical vocabulary and some varied and nuanced writing.

Regarding presentation, however, all examiners commented on the increasing problem of illegibility. In some cases, this was so severe that the meaning of some paragraphs was obscured. It is a huge pity when work is compromised as the reader cannot follow the flow of argument and explanation. Regarding the appropriate writing tool, it is a Cambridge International Examinations requirement that candidates use a ballpoint pen. Fountain or roller ball type pens can cause the ink to 'bleed through' the examination booklet paper therefore making writing illegible. Candidates should understand that poor handwriting can make their work difficult, and in some cases impossible, to read.

In terms of academic performance, the main distinction was at the higher end of the mark range between those answers in which an attempt was made to offer sustained and supported judgements in response to the question and those in which a series of supported explanations was presented. Often the quality of the explanations was high but the evaluative essence of questions like 'What best explains...', 'To what extent' or 'How far do you agree...' was not addressed. The different factors were often identified clearly at the start, then explained (with various degrees of support in what was often a structured answer) then reprised in the final paragraph. This did not demonstrate the higher level analytical skills required for the higher mark bands. At the lower end of the mark range, the material deployed was not always used in support of arguments but more for its own sake and the explanations were more like assertions. Better answers saw the implications of the question and took the concept as the starting point then discussed the criteria for success, the extent of success and offered an overview. Weaker responses started with different elements of the reign or different aspects of policy, set them out and then offered a comment on whether they were successful or not. This approach took weaker answers further and further away from the exact terms of the question. For example, analyses of what explained why Lord Liverpool was in office for so long which did not focus on the key concept of the longevity of his ministries soon became answers to a question that had not actually been asked (such as 'how successful were the policies of Liverpool' or 'how well did he deal with the radical threat'). These answers were written without sufficient thought to the exact question which had been asked. Reliance on prepared answers is a dangerous examination strategy especially where the answer is also factually incorrect, or contains misunderstandings. When answering questions on the Elizabethan Parliament or the Puritans making reference to historians can be illuminating and helpful, but candidates should avoid making references to works written many years ago. Modern historians now consider these past debates irrelevant. For questions on historical issues before 1800 that involved the Whigs, candidates should be sure to describe the Whig view. However, there is a tendency to assume that there is a Whig view of every historical issue before 1800 and this should be discouraged.

When approaching questions, candidates should aim to discuss the main factor first. For example, if a question asks 'How important was Lord Salisbury in maintaining Conservative supremacy ...' there should be substantial consideration of his leadership in the first two, or possibly three pages.

Lastly, candidates should show understanding of the key concepts relevant to the period being studied and know the required specialist vocabulary (which is not extensive). For example, they should understand the different aspects between 'domestic' and 'foreign' policies. Those candidates who have studied the history of the Labour party should also know what is meant by 'socialism', particular in the context of the Labour ministries of 1945 to 1951.

Some key elements of candidates' responses were very successful. Firstly, most candidates offered three full essays and used their time well. Final responses were not generally weak nor appeared rushed. Though, in comparison with the first two essays attempted, naturally many candidates often did their best answer first. Secondly, answers were generally clearly structured and easy to follow. Thirdly, the quality and variety of language was often high with many telling phrases and clear explanations. Finally, knowledge was often more than adequate with some good detail.

The following comments are offered on questions where there were enough answers to make general trends apparent. It is a pity that there is a relative lack of answers to questions in the Themes sections, but there was a range of questions attempted.

Comments on specific questions

- 7 This was a popular question and candidates showed much sound knowledge. Better answers identified the problems Henry faced before assessing his ability in solving them. Some of these stressed his inexperience and so argued that his success owed a good deal to his ability in choosing advisers wisely and following a carrot and stick policy. Analysis of the difficulties in his later years argued that it was circumstances, rather than a lack of ability, which led to these problems. Weaker answers had problems in selecting relevant and convincing material. Some of these went into much detail about the pretenders, rather than analysing how Henry's dealings with Simnel and Warbeck displayed his ability or lack of it. Similarly, less strong arguments centred on the methods Henry used in government, finance and dealing with the nobles, without examining how far these revealed his ability. With unconvincing evidence and sparse arguments, some weak answers maintained that Henry had no ability at all and died to general acclaim after a miserly and autocratic reign.
- 8 Virtually all responses realised that it was necessary to define 'the interests of Henry VIII'. Better responses suggested that the raising of sufficient revenue, the preservation of law and order, the maintenance of royal authority and the pursuit of foreign glory were all in the interests of the monarch. Some answers argued that Wolsey pursued his own interests more than those of Henry VIII as a way to show that he was not effective, while others made a counter-argument from his apparent failures. Either approach was acceptable. Weaker answers described his policies and often became enmeshed in detail, so that a clear judgement was never reached. Stronger work took the line that Wolsey knew only too well that royal interests must prevail and that his government was entirely geared to this end. His lack of effectiveness was soundly assessed by such answers. Responses needed to show an accurate understanding of the subsidy, the Chancery and the Star Chamber, but this was not always evident.
- 10 There were many answers to this question which did not address its terms precisely. The question was asking 'why was the reign unsettled', not how unsettled it was. Thus responses which challenged the term 'unsettled' were not able to achieve within the higher mark bands. Some weaker responses instead of discussing the troubles under Somerset concentrated on the achievements of Northumberland. Other weaker responses omitted the religious issues, some suggesting that religion was not a problem in this period and some, within the context of the reign, explored the legacy of Henry VIII as a major cause of instability. Long accounts of the events of the early 1540s and the problems with Henry VIII's legacy detracted from the focus of the question. Better responses analysed how far the rule of a minor, foreign entanglements, social and economic difficulties, religious uncertainty and problems over the succession led to instability. However, they did not always argue how these were reasons for the 'unsettled' nature of the reign. Answers needed a clearer understanding of what made an unstable government in mid-Tudor England.

- 11** Many answers to this question displayed strong knowledge of the events of 1559–1563 and the emergence of the religious settlement. Weaker responses were not able to use what they knew to answer effectively the specific question and some could not provide a clear definition of Elizabeth's aims. Without these criteria as a benchmark, a satisfactory assessment could not be achieved. Suggesting that Elizabeth herself was unsure of her aims was not an acceptable defence. Better answers indicated that her main aim was a settlement which could be embraced by the broadest possible demographic, one which Parliament would pass, one which would not instantly render Catholic Europe more hostile and one which reflected her personal tastes. These responses generally concluded that the Queen largely achieved what she wanted. Some weaker work went well beyond 1563 and brought in challenges to the settlement from later in the reign, but this was not relevant.
- 12** This was a popular question and most responses were well focused. Most responses noted the years in the question, although there were some which went into much detail about Mary's matrimonial adventures and her subsequent downfall. These did not often attain the higher mark bands. Stronger answers were able to assess the threat clearly, arguing that Mary was an attractive figurehead for Catholic conspiracies and that the European context made her even more menacing. They also picked up the reference to the 'Elizabethan regime' and showed how Elizabeth's advisers and Justices of the Peace were fully aware of being personally at risk were Mary to become queen. Some perceptive answers suggested that the fact that the conspiracies were discovered and Mary executed, did not necessarily mean she was still not a threat, but some of these strayed into discussing the Armada and the 1590s.
- 13** This question was rarely well answered. There was sound knowledge of the proceedings of Elizabeth's parliaments and of the means by which she controlled them, but answers struggled to use this relevantly. Weaker responses tended to describe a number of issues which arose between the Queen and Parliament and then assert that she was helped or hindered thereby. Other weaker work did not show a clear understanding of the role of Parliament in Elizabethan government, while there were others focused on debates about the elusive 'Puritan choir' or about 'men of business' and Thomas Norton. Better responses were organised differently, as they identified areas where Parliament was 'more of a help' in passing legislation, notably on social and economic matters, and making financial grants. These answers then examined ways in which parliaments were 'more of a hindrance', such as through trying to revise the settlement, urging the Queen to marry and name a successor, pressing for the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots and criticising monopolies. They often concluded that the short duration of parliaments lessened considerably their power to be a hindrance.
- 14** Many of the answers to this question were insufficiently focused on the mid-1580s. The assertion that Philip II was still harbouring a grudge because Elizabeth had rejected his proposal of marriage some twenty-five years previously was not convincing. Similarly, less strong answers had much to say about the treacherous Spanish attacks on Hawkins and Drake and the impounding of Spanish bullion by Elizabeth. Better answers concentrated on the issues which dominated the 1580s and put the Netherlands at the centre of their arguments, showing that Elizabeth could not safely allow Spain to defeat the revolt and that Philip could not defeat the Dutch until he had eliminated the English. Stronger work suggested that religion and the attacks of English privateers in the Spanish Empire played a part but that these alone did not form an adequate cause for war. Some weaker work barely mentioned the Netherlands therefore could not reach the higher mark bands.
- 26** Many answers dealt with the issue of how James II lost support or why the Glorious Revolution occurred, but the question demanded more consistent focus to why 'he was unable to retain his throne'. The best answers combined an analysis of some longer term factors with James' actions in 1688.
- 28** Candidates were well informed on the strengths and weaknesses of the Jacobite movement in the period under examination, and focused well on the weaknesses of the 1715 and 1745 rebellions, particularly the poor leadership demonstrated by the Jacobite élites. Some candidates referred to the more revisionist views on the strengths of the 1715 rebellion and explained the necessity of foreign intervention. However, while some answers were very well argued, some reflected on why the Jacobite rebellions failed rather than describe more positively what they achieved and how they almost succeeded. There was not much mention of Jacobite activity outside the main rebellions, or much examination of the support for Jacobitism across the whole of the British Isles.

- 29** Some answers were able to give a range of reasons for Walpole's longevity, and some candidates were able to evaluate the question's emphasis on the remarkable length of Walpole's dominance. Walpole's use of patronage and his control of Parliament were discussed in some depth, but the focus on royal support was given mixed coverage. Some responses discussed Walpole's relations with the Hanoverians, though this coverage varied with the best showing how this bore on the other factors, while others gave it little attention.
- 30** Candidates discussed Pitt's contribution to victory in the Seven Years' War particularly his strategic thinking and his energetic leadership, with the Prussian alliances and the key naval strategy of Blue Water being attributed to him. Candidates also discussed how the Navy and other leaders were also important, as well as how ineffective some of Pitt's decisions were. On the whole, the question of whether Pitt was a 'saviour' was not addressed explicitly.
- 32** Candidates discussed George III's monarchical record in the 1760s by referring to a range of actions such as the appointment of Bute, and the rapid turnover of administrations in the period. Generally, answers had a fairly negative view of George III on the grounds of his inexperience and blamed him for most of the problems. The issue of how effective George III was in the context of the end of the Seven Years' War and other issues were not explored as far as they could have been.
- 33** Candidates were keen to argue that the British lost the War of Independence through their strategy of Blue Water and its inability to concentrate enough soldiers in America to allow the British to achieve victory. This meant that answers were not always directly focused precisely on the question. While foreign intervention could be linked to the British strategic errors, some candidates did not see the relevance of American military tactics so they were not fully explored by, nor did they discuss the American contribution in any significant detail.
- 34** Candidates tended to discuss Pitt's financial achievements with the Sinking Fund and the moves against smuggling, alongside other issues such as his ability to maintain his political position and to manage the Regency crisis. Though Pitt's ability was discussed, some answers did not analyse sufficiently whether the restoration of national finances was his greatest achievement and just described what he did. Other answers discussed the early years of the Revolutionary Wars, rather than focusing on the question.
- 35** Candidates discussed the impact of the French Revolution on providing a context of increased radicalism through the corresponding societies, and how this allowed Pitt to create a more repressive political system and allowed the Whigs to be easily portrayed as unpatriotic and sympathetic to the Revolution. There was also discussion of Fox's poor leadership and the split in the Whigs which saw Portland ally with the Pitt administration. Candidates did not fully address the dynamic nature of the Revolution and how the changing nature of its radicalism and the outbreak of war with Britain increasingly undermined the Whigs as the decade passed by.
- 36** Candidates explained the British mixed fortunes in the French Revolutionary War of 1793–1801 by examining her naval strengths against the inability to make an impact on land given the French strengths. The vagaries of coalition politics were also discussed, though some candidates went beyond the date restrictions of the question. Several candidates did not address the 'best explains' part of the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/13
British History Outlines, 1688–c. 2000

Key messages

- Make sure that you know the key concepts relevant to the period.
- Read the question carefully and think about its implications.
- Write clearly and legibly using ball point pen.
- Make sure that the information which you include is relevant to the question.
- Give the historian's name when describing their argument.

General comments

There was much detailed and relevant knowledge and argument. Many answers reflected an obvious enthusiasm for the topics and there were many confident judgements offered. The standard of communication was often high with good use of historical vocabulary and some varied and nuanced writing.

Regarding presentation, however, all examiners commented on the increasing problem of illegibility. In some cases, this was so severe that the meaning of some paragraphs was obscured. It is a huge pity when work is compromised as the reader cannot follow the flow of argument and explanation. Regarding the appropriate writing tool, it is a Cambridge International Examinations requirement that candidates use a ballpoint pen. Fountain or roller ball type pens can cause the ink to 'bleed through' the examination booklet paper therefore making writing illegible. Candidates should understand that poor handwriting can make their work difficult, and in some cases impossible, to read.

In terms of academic performance, the main distinction was at the higher end of the mark range between those answers in which an attempt was made to offer sustained and supported judgements in response to the question and those in which a series of supported explanations was presented. Often the quality of the explanations was high but the evaluative essence of questions like 'What best explains...', 'To what extent' or 'How far do you agree...' was not addressed. The different factors were often identified clearly at the start, then explained (with various degrees of support in what was often a structured answer) then reprised in the final paragraph. This did not demonstrate the higher level analytical skills required for the higher mark bands. At the lower end of the mark range, the material deployed was not always used in support of arguments but more for its own sake and the explanations were more like assertions. Better answers saw the implications of the question and took the concept as the starting point then discussed the criteria for success, the extent of success and offered an overview. Weaker responses started with different elements of the reign or different aspects of policy, set them out and then offered a comment on whether they were successful or not. This approach took weaker answers further and further away from the exact terms of the question. For example, analyses of what explained why Lord Liverpool was in office for so long which did not focus on the key concept of the longevity of his ministries soon became answers to a question that had not actually been asked (such as 'how successful were the policies of Liverpool' or 'how well did he deal with the radical threat'). These answers were written without sufficient thought to the exact question which had been asked. Reliance on prepared answers is a dangerous examination strategy especially where the answer is also factually incorrect, or contains misunderstandings. When answering questions on the Elizabethan Parliament or the Puritans making reference to historians can be illuminating and helpful, but candidates should avoid making references to works written many years ago. Modern historians now consider these past debates irrelevant. For questions on historical issues before 1800 that involved the Whigs, candidates should be sure to describe the Whig view. However, there is a tendency to assume that there is a Whig view of every historical issue before 1800 and this should be discouraged.

When approaching questions, candidates should aim to discuss the main factor first. For example, if a question asks 'How important was Lord Salisbury in maintaining Conservative supremacy ...' there should be substantial consideration of his leadership in the first two, or possibly three pages.

Lastly, candidates should show understanding of the key concepts relevant to the period being studied and know the required specialist vocabulary (which is not extensive). For example, they should understand the different aspects between 'domestic' and 'foreign' policies. Those candidates who have studied the history of the Labour party should also know what is meant by 'socialism', particular in the context of the Labour ministries of 1945 to 1951.

Some key elements of candidates' responses were very successful. Firstly, most candidates offered three full essays and used their time well. Final responses were not generally weak nor appeared rushed. Though, in comparison with the first two essays attempted, naturally many candidates often did their best answer first. Secondly, answers were generally clearly structured and easy to follow. Thirdly, the quality and variety of language was often high with many telling phrases and clear explanations. Finally, knowledge was often more than adequate with some good detail.

The following comments are offered on questions where there were enough answers to make general trends apparent. It is a pity that there is a relative lack of answers to questions in the Themes sections, but there was a range of questions attempted

Comments on specific questions

- 17** There was some strong knowledge of aspects of Liverpool's policies but this was not always applied to the question. Many candidates did not give enough attention to 'his personal qualities'. There was some good analysis of his management of controversial issues and some compared the disunity which followed his death with the greater cohesiveness of the ministry under his guidance. There were other factors considered but there could have been more discussion of the disunity of the Whigs, and of the changes made after 1822.
- 18** There was good understanding of the demands of the question, although most answers were unable to support arguments and explanations with sufficient evidence and detail. Many answers contained vague references to unemployment being a factor. The best answers usually argued that economic hardship gave rise to politically aware radicals. It would have helped some weaker answers to maintain more focus on the actual question rather than rehearsing explanations of the rise and fall of Chartism.
- 19** Many candidates chose to interpret the question as successes and failures rather than 'strengths and weaknesses'. They need to be careful about focusing on the precise terms of the question, especially when making a judgement about whether strengths outweighed weaknesses. The best answers typically included an analysis of whether the handling of the crisis over the Corn Laws might be considered to be a sign of strength or weakness. Some weaker answers did not sufficiently analyse other aspects of Peel's ministry, while others described Peel's earlier career which was not a focus of the question.
- 20** Some candidates just considered why Disraeli was successful in passing the Act. Answers needed to display a tighter focus on why Disraeli was successful in passing the Act when Gladstone had failed only 'a year earlier'.
- 22** Some weaker answers either misunderstood the demands of the question (some included foreign policy) or attempted to alter the terms of the question to a simple analysis of the success of Disraeli's government. Some answers only analysed legislation to assess the extent to which it was permissive. Better answers tended to explore the permissive features of legislation in depth, as well as considering evidence of Disraeli's efforts to deal with the social question. Better answers also responded more directly to the concepts of 'show' and 'substance'.
- 23** Some answers showed limited understanding of what is meant by the term 'European power politics' and weaker answers were unable to give examples of the economic benefits of colonial expansion. Others dealt with this issue in depth, although few answers dealt with the issue of colonial expansion as a civilising or Christian mission.
- 24** There were some very good answers which demonstrated how Salisbury managed to exploit Liberal weaknesses and linked him with the developments in the Party organisation, as well as showing his importance in maintaining dominance of the legislation introduced. Explicit judgements were made about the relative importance of his leadership. Weaker answers were unable to

sufficiently explain the ways in which Salisbury himself had an impact on the dominance of the Conservatives. Weaker answers also offered lists of reasons which sometimes omitted the important element of the split in the Liberals and Salisbury's alliance with Chamberlain.

- 25** In order to help reach a judgement, stronger answers to this question engaged effectively with both the terms of the question and different interpretations, and sensibly considered the aims of welfare provision by Liberal governments 1905–14. It is important, however, that candidates studying this period understand the terms 'welfare state' and 'social reforms', as there were answers which simply considered the success or otherwise of various aspects of Liberal policy with limited focus on the question.
- 26** There was some good focus on the issue of 'solely' from many candidates and the strongest answers showed a strong awareness and engagement with recent historiographical developments, and some used foreign office papers to support arguments. However, there was confusion about the nature of Britain's 'alliances' and what exactly they entailed in terms of obligations. Also some candidates treated the question as why did Britain quarrel with Germany and offered limited explanation of 'expansionism'. Weaker answers consisted of a simple description of why war broke out, whereas the question was specifically concerned with Britain's reasons for going to war.
- 34** The focus of many answers were on Liberal weakness rather than Labour strengths. There was some uncertainty of how the Lloyd George coalition should be treated and what it meant for Labour. The Constitution of 1918 was somewhat neglected. While many answers cited MacDonald's leadership as a Labour strength, little evidence was offered either to demonstrate or support what was meant. Electoral changes and the growth of Trade Unions were covered with varying degrees of depth or detail. Some answers would have been stronger if they had covered the whole period.
- 35** A number of answers misunderstood the question or simply described the work of the League of Nations in the 1920s and 1930s, with little focus on the importance of the League in the conduct of British foreign policy. Better answers demonstrated how Britain supported or undermined the work of the League on occasions in the 1920s and 1930s, but few answers suggested the League became less important in the conduct of foreign policy as time progressed. There was also a lack of awareness of the wider work of the League and Britain's support for this, such as the supervision of mandates.
- 37** Stronger answers were able to weigh up the extent to which policies pursued by the Labour government were truly socialist. There was a lot of interest in the National Health Service but rather less in the nationalisation programme, though some drew a distinction between public ownership and the way that the nationalised industries were run. Some answers tended to outline policies and then say that they were or were not 'socialist' in an assertive way. Weaker answers showed a lack of understanding of the meaning of 'socialism' as an ideology and simply assessed whether the Labour government introduced any meaningful reform, with a lack of focus on the demands of the question.
- 38** Stronger answers discussed Conservative policies such as the house-building scheme and immigration, as well as the beginnings of the consumer boom. Weaker answers described what the Conservatives did in general terms without much focus on either assessing the success of economic policies, or the degree to which they managed the problem of social cohesion beyond some generalisations on the growing racial tensions in Britain.
- 39** Rather than a sustained argument across well-structured paragraphs, most candidates provided a chronological survey of relations between the government and the Trades Unions in the 1960s and 1970s, offering some general analytical points explaining the poor relations. 'In Place of Strife' was cited as was Heath's problems, but answers did not provide any clarity beyond weak, indecisive governments that failed to stand up consistently to the Unions.
- 41** Candidates discussed the Single European Act as an argument for the effectiveness of Mrs Thatcher's policies, but otherwise there was not a great deal of detail in their answers. Most detail related to Mrs Thatcher's preference for the US alliance on the basis of her relationship with President Reagan, usually discussed in the context of the Westland affair, but without a clear analysis of how effective British European policy actually was.

- 42** Candidates tended to focus on Conservative disarray, rather than on Labour strengths. The various sexual scandals that plagued John Major's premiership were often recounted in quite significant detail, as was Black Wednesday and the impact of this on the Conservative Party's economic credibility. There was some discussion of Blair being young and charismatic, and a few candidates mentioned the Clause 4 debates, but there was little coverage of other factors such as support from the media and Labour's strategy of capturing swing voters. While most answers were focused on the issue of explaining the result of the 1997 election, few engaged with the issue of the 'decisiveness' of the victory.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/21
European History Outlines,
c. 300–c. 1500

Key messages

- Make sure that you know the key concepts relevant to the period.
- Read the question carefully and think about its implications.
- Write clearly and legibly using ball point pen.
- Make sure that the information which you include is relevant to the question.
- Give the historian's name when describing their argument.

General comments

There was much detailed and relevant knowledge and argument. Many answers reflected an obvious enthusiasm for the topics and there were many confident judgements offered. The standard of communication was often high with good use of historical vocabulary and some varied and nuanced writing.

Regarding presentation, however, all examiners commented on the increasing problem of illegibility. In some cases, this was so severe that the meaning of some paragraphs was obscured. It is a huge pity when work is compromised as the reader cannot follow the flow of argument and explanation. Regarding the appropriate writing tool, it is a Cambridge International Examinations requirement that candidates use a ballpoint pen. Fountain or roller ball type pens can cause the ink to 'bleed through' the examination booklet paper therefore making writing illegible. Candidates should understand that poor handwriting can make their work difficult, and in some cases impossible, to read.

In terms of academic performance, the main distinction was at the higher end of the mark range between those answers in which an attempt was made to offer sustained and supported judgements in response to the question and those in which a series of supported explanations was presented. Often the quality of the explanations was high but the evaluative essence of questions like 'What best explains...', 'To what extent' or 'How far do you agree...' was not addressed. The different factors were often identified clearly at the start, then explained (with various degrees of support in what was often a structured answer) then reprised in the final paragraph. This did not demonstrate the higher level analytical skills required for the higher mark bands. At the lower end of the mark range, the material deployed was not always used in support of arguments but more for its own sake and the explanations were more like assertions. Better answers saw the implications of the question and took the concept as the starting point then discussed the criteria for success, the extent of success and offered an overview. Weaker responses started with different elements of the reign or different aspects of policy, set them out and then offered a comment on whether they were successful or not. This approach took weaker answers further and further away from the exact terms of the question. For example, analyses of whether the League of Nations was a 'successful experiment ruined by the Great Depression' demands more than an account of the success and failures of the League of Nations. Similarly, if a question asks for more than one element, then prepared lists which focus just on one part will not provide an adequate response. Reliance on prepared answers is a dangerous examination strategy especially where the answer is also factually incorrect, or contains misunderstandings. Every question on the Holocaust does not need a description of the Intentionalist or Structuralist views. Neither do Marxist views of the French Revolution have to be imported, regardless of the question. Another redundant element in some answers was comparison with events in a different period. It is not very helpful to compare Philip II with Mussolini, for instance or Joseph II with Stalin.

When approaching questions, candidates should aim to discuss the main factor first. For example, if a question asks 'How important was insensitive rule from Spain in causing the Dutch revolt ...' there should be substantial consideration of the Spanish rule over the Dutch in the first two, or possibly three pages.

Lastly, candidates should show understanding of the key concepts relevant to the period being studied and know the required specialist vocabulary (which is not extensive). For example, they should understand the different aspects between 'domestic' and 'foreign' policies. Those candidates who have studied the rulers of the later eighteenth century should know what is meant by the term 'enlightened' just as Fascism should be understood by those studying twentieth century Italy.

Some key elements of candidates' responses were very successful. Firstly, most candidates offered three full essays and used their time well. Final responses were not generally weak nor appeared rushed. Though, in comparison with the first two essays attempted, naturally many candidates often did their best answer first. Secondly, answers were generally clearly structured and easy to follow. Thirdly, the quality and variety of language was often high with many telling phrases and clear explanations. Finally, knowledge was often more than adequate with some good detail.

The following comments are offered on questions where there were enough answers to make general trends apparent. It is a pity that there is a relative lack of answers to questions in the Themes sections, but there was a range of questions attempted.

Comments on specific questions

- 7 There were some strong answers which focused fully on analysing Charlemagne's priorities and often concluded by arguing that his priorities changed over time, in that, once his military ambitions were largely achieved, his religious aims became paramount. They were able to use their detailed knowledge of the events of the reign appropriately and select relevant examples to illustrate their points. Some assessed the degree to which his military exploits resulted from necessity as much as ambition and sometimes this argument proved to be a distraction. Weaker answers would have benefited from a more analytical approach, rather than describing the campaigns and the details of the religious edicts. They needed to approach the question by considering the two aspects as their focus, instead of selecting policies and events and then asserting that these showed one or the other priority.
- 9 There were not many answers to this question and they did not engage well with its terms. They needed to find a way into the question. One or two stronger answers suggested that the Vikings were mostly successful traders and that it was the minority which used the methods of barbarian warriors, and with sound support this was a successful approach. Other stronger responses pointed to the way in which Vikings settled down in Normandy and integrated with the local population. Less effective answers gave an account of Viking raids and destruction, and neglected the trading aspect. They needed to have a clearer plan in mind before embarking on their answers.
- 10 The stronger answers to this question recognised that they needed to do more than explain why there was instability in Germany, and addressed the reasons for it being so notable. This involved a consideration of factors which had not been so marked earlier or brought a new dimension to events in Germany, such as the break-up of Charlemagne's Empire and the stability it had brought, along with endless problems over succession and the role of some individuals. Some of these argued that the end of the Carolingians and the accession of a non-Frank, Henry the Fowler, was the turning point in Germany. Weaker responses gave an account of events and drew some explanations from these, but did not focus sufficiently on the worsening instability.
- 11 There were strong responses which were able to establish some grounds on which success could be judged in Germany in this period. These answers often explained the context of Otto's succession with the defeats his father suffered and his own minority with female regents. This was an effective way of approaching the question and generally led to the conclusion that, despite the brevity of his reign, he enjoyed remarkable success. Weaker answers tended to be descriptive and leave the reader to draw conclusions about the extent of Otto's success and, therefore, lacked a clear focus on the 'How successful' terms of the question.
- 12 The stronger answers to this question took careful note of the word 'entirely'. They then argued that, great though the contribution of Roger II was, it was not the sole reason for the success of Norman rule in Italy. Often they suggested that the foundations laid by Robert Guiscard played a role, while the excellent civil service, supervised by Roger admittedly, was another factor. Several illustrated how Roger was an important part of Norman success by referring to his rough treatment of Innocent II who had dared to excommunicate him. Weaker responses were not able to use the

material with any confidence and often listed Roger's achievements, when they needed to consider their role in Norman rule in Sicily.

- 14** Stronger responses began with giving some explanation of the Investiture Contest. This was a key discriminating factor, as without clarity on this issue, answers could not focus adequately. Strong arguments were made for either side emerging victorious, depending on whether the judgement was on immediate or more long-term results. These well-argued responses rarely had much sympathy for Gregory VII. Less effective responses were not well focused on the issues at the heart of the Contest. Some of these needed to move beyond papal targeting of simony and clerical marriage to the crucial matter of lay investiture. In these answers, an understanding of the impact of the challenge by the papacy to the authority of lay rulers was not always effectively demonstrated.
- 15** There were a number of stronger responses to this question, which recognised that the only motives of the Crusaders which needed to be discussed were those specifically mentioned in the question. These answers were able to provide sound knowledge of the religious background to the First Crusade and also the economic and social conditions which led to the profit motive being strong. Sound answers were able to see that there was some blurring in the motivation of Crusaders, so that leaders intent on reaching the Holy City and atoning for their sins, were not averse to some material gains as well. Weaker answers were sometimes one-sided, arguing that either profit or piety mattered more and neglecting to write much about the alternative. Some of these had insufficient knowledge of individual Crusaders to be able to exemplify the motives they identified.
- 16** There were not very many answers to this question, but some of them were strong enough to assess a series of factors and reach a supported conclusion. One or two of the strongest had an impressive understanding of the conflict between the Guelfs and the Ghibellines. Most of the stronger answers saw the weakness as rooted in the death of Henry V without a clear successor and argued cogently that all the later ills followed from this cause. Some of the individuals involved such as Conrad III and Henry the Lion also got a share of the blame. Weaker answers were unable to master the intricacies of the situation and only asserted a few explanations, often with insufficient detailed support, or, in other cases some inaccurate information.
- 17** This was a popular question and stronger answers dissected the reign efficiently. They identified specific mistakes and successes and saw that some events, like the marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine, and the subsequent divorce, could justifiably be classified as both over time. Strong answers considered aspects of the reign such as the early influence of Abbot Suger, the promotion of feudal monarchy and the raising of revenue as successes, while the Second Crusade figured in the list of failures. Louis' character failings were blamed for some of his mistakes in some answers, while others saw him as a victim of circumstances. Weaker answers showed an inability to organise the material effectively and often selected events from the reign and concluded that they were either successes or mistakes. These answers needed to be planned more thoughtfully, with the focus made clear from the start of the work.
- 18** There were strong answers to this question which had a clear definition of political intrigue. They cited some sound examples, including the exploitation of the quarrels between Henry II and his sons, benefiting from the absence of Richard I to plot against him, the Treaty of Le Goulet and the outwitting of King John. They were then able to go on to look at other reasons, such as the financial resources he built up, his administrative grasp, his powerful personality, his decisive victory at Bouvines and the unpopularity of the Angevins. There were, however, a number of weaker responses which showed a degree of uncertainty about the definition of political intrigue. These answers explained some of the reasons for Philip's success, but if they did not consider the factor in the question, they could not attain the higher mark bands. They needed to avoid the technique of outlining a cause of success and then suggesting that it was or was not an example of intrigue. Knowledge was not an issue in most answers, but relevant selection to back up arguments was less strongly demonstrated.
- 19** Stronger responses to this question immediately identified examples of rulers on whom Innocent III sought to impose his will or issues over which he expected the co-operation of rulers. It was not expected that King John would be included, but answers which discussed his defiance of Innocent were allowed. The strongest responses recognised that Innocent could be successful in some aspects and fail in others with the same ruler, most notably Philip Augustus. Some of these answers argued that Innocent's influence outlived him and included some pertinent comments on

the impact of the reforms on rulers, especially the results of the Lateran Council. Weaker responses concentrated on a single ruler, usually the French monarch and some of these considered Philip was obedient to the papal wishes, despite the king's refusal to take his wife back until faced with an Interdict or to crusade against the Cathars. These responses were not very confident in dealing with Innocent's complex manoeuvres over the Empire, when they included it as an example.

- 25** Few strong answers were seen, because most responses failed to observe that the question referred only to 'intellectual developments'. Hence weaker answers which included the artistic advances of the century were marred by irrelevance. An approach to this question might have been to analyse the contribution of scholars like John of Salisbury, Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter Abelard and assess the role of emerging centres of learning.
- 28** Stronger responses to this question made some initial judgements about what serving the Church well might mean in the context of Louis IX's reign. These answers showed an ability to analyse the material effectively and often argued that Louis may have seemed to be serving the Church by going on crusade but that his limited achievements undermined the value of his contribution. Louis' pursuit of peace and his role as an arbiter were used in these answers to illustrate how he served the Church. Above all, his encouragement of the Inquisition in France to extirpate heresy was viewed as a great service. The strongest answers noted that by taking on some of the attributes normally associated with the papacy, Louis was not necessarily serving the Church well. Weaker answers were not able to select relevant material effectively and some included superfluous argument about how Louis governed France, trying to suggest that maintaining law and order was serving the Church well.
- 29** Responses to this question were usually on the stronger side as they were well focused on the issue. Most of these argued effectively that the characters of the protagonists were enough to explain the quarrel, and some went so far as to suggest that the two men were simply looking for an opportunity to pursue one another. Others took the line that it was Philip's pressing need for money to fight Edward I which was the root cause of the quarrel. There was also some good analysis about how far papal claims had begun to seem over-stated by this period. The few weaker responses were narratives of the quarrel or chose to focus on why it was so protracted.
- 30** Stronger responses to this question recognised that, although most of Europe believed that the French benefited from excessive influence over the Avignon popes, in fact, the Avignon papacy was more marked by developments which favoured the pontiffs. Such responses considered the greater safety which Avignon provided, the way the popes were able to continue to promote Crusades and the work of centralising Church administration which they were able to achieve. Their luxurious court at Avignon was another of their gains, described fully in some responses. Some responses which argued well about the papal gains, found it more problematic to mount a counter-argument about the actual benefits that the French rulers derived, apart from the prestige and influence on papal elections. Weaker answers described the actions of the Avignon popes, not always with full understanding or accuracy, and then tried to make this relevant to the question being asked.
- 34** There were some very strong answers to this question, which considered the alternatives and arrived at a well-supported conclusion. They were fully informed about Hussite theology and about the nationalist ambitions of Czech patriots like Hus and Ziska. Their judgements about which mattered more went either way depending on their use of the evidence and how far into the fifteenth century they advanced. Weaker responses gave an account of the Hussite movement but without strong attention to the focus of the question.
- 36** Stronger responses to this question gave due consideration to 'English incompetence', often linked to the accession of a minor monarch and the resulting fall-out, and then to other explanations such as the role of Joan of Arc and the French revival. However, these answers rarely made much of the Burgundian change of sides from the English to the French in 1435, which could be seen as a decisive turning point in the War. Weaker responses gave a description of a few episodes in the later stages of the War or failed to say much about 'English incompetence'. They needed to bring a sense of argument about the main cause of the English defeat to their answers, along, sometimes, with a stronger grasp of events.

- 38** There were a few stronger responses to this question where good knowledge and judgement about the papacy in this period was displayed, but most of the answers were accounts of the life style of the Renaissance papacy concentrating on the roles of Alexander VI and his son Cesare. Hence, these answers largely agreed with the view expressed in the question. They tended to assume that building programmes were to boost the reputation of their papal originators rather than for the glory of God, and that the desire to stem the onrush of the Turks was similarly for reasons of political power. The role of the papacy in the Italian Wars was often assessed rather better and the difficult choices faced by the popes appreciated. Some weaker answers interpreted the question as focusing on the papacy over the century after the conciliar movement and went on to discuss the Counter-Reformation, which was too liberal an approach to the period, which could not be stretched further than 1527 at most.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/22
European History Outlines,
c. 1400–c. 1800

Key messages

- Make sure that you know the key concepts relevant to the period.
- Read the question carefully and think about its implications.
- Write clearly and legibly using ball point pen.
- Make sure that the information which you include is relevant to the question.
- Give the historian's name when describing their argument.

General comments

There was much detailed and relevant knowledge and argument. Many answers reflected an obvious enthusiasm for the topics and there were many confident judgements offered. The standard of communication was often high with good use of historical vocabulary and some varied and nuanced writing.

Regarding presentation, however, all examiners commented on the increasing problem of illegibility. In some cases, this was so severe that the meaning of some paragraphs was obscured. It is a huge pity when work is compromised as the reader cannot follow the flow of argument and explanation. Regarding the appropriate writing tool, it is a Cambridge International Examinations requirement that candidates use a ballpoint pen. Fountain or roller ball type pens can cause the ink to 'bleed through' the examination booklet paper therefore making writing illegible. Candidates should understand that poor handwriting can make their work difficult, and in some cases impossible, to read.

In terms of academic performance, the main distinction was at the higher end of the mark range between those answers in which an attempt was made to offer sustained and supported judgements in response to the question and those in which a series of supported explanations was presented. Often the quality of the explanations was high but the evaluative essence of questions like 'What best explains...', 'To what extent' or 'How far do you agree...' was not addressed. The different factors were often identified clearly at the start, then explained (with various degrees of support in what was often a structured answer) then reprised in the final paragraph. This did not demonstrate the higher level analytical skills required for the higher mark bands. At the lower end of the mark range, the material deployed was not always used in support of arguments but more for its own sake and the explanations were more like assertions. Better answers saw the implications of the question and took the concept as the starting point then discussed the criteria for success, the extent of success and offered an overview. Weaker responses started with different elements of the reign or different aspects of policy, set them out and then offered a comment on whether they were successful or not. This approach took weaker answers further and further away from the exact terms of the question. For example, analyses of whether the League of Nations was a 'successful experiment ruined by the Great Depression' demands more than an account of the success and failures of the League of Nations. Similarly, if a question asks for more than one element, then prepared lists which focus just on one part will not provide an adequate response. Reliance on prepared answers is a dangerous examination strategy especially where the answer is also factually incorrect, or contains misunderstandings. Every question on the Holocaust does not need a description of the Intentionalist or Structuralist views. Neither do Marxist views of the French Revolution have to be imported, regardless of the question. Another redundant element in some answers was comparison with events in a different period. It is not very helpful to compare Philip II with Mussolini, for instance or Joseph II with Stalin.

When approaching questions, candidates should aim to discuss the main factor first. For example, if a question asks 'How important was insensitive rule from Spain in causing the Dutch revolt ...' there should be substantial consideration of the Spanish rule over the Dutch in the first two, or possibly three pages.

Lastly, candidates should show understanding of the key concepts relevant to the period being studied and know the required specialist vocabulary (which is not extensive). For example, they should understand the different aspects between 'domestic' and 'foreign' policies. Those candidates who have studied the rulers of the later eighteenth century should know what is meant by the term 'enlightened' just as Fascism should be understood by those studying twentieth century Italy.

Some key elements of candidates' responses were very successful. Firstly, most candidates offered three full essays and used their time well. Final responses were not generally weak nor appeared rushed. Though, in comparison with the first two essays attempted, naturally many candidates often did their best answer first. Secondly, answers were generally clearly structured and easy to follow. Thirdly, the quality and variety of language was often high with many telling phrases and clear explanations. Finally, knowledge was often more than adequate with some good detail.

The following comments are offered on questions where there were enough answers to make general trends apparent. It is a pity that there is a relative lack of answers to questions in the Themes sections, but there was a range of questions attempted.

Comments on specific questions

- 8** The key to this question was the focus on 'rapid' and the entire period of 1451 to 1520. Answers which covered the whole range of period were able to analyse 'best explains' and the rapidity of the expansion. Some less successful answers lacked knowledge about the geographical extent of Ottoman expansion and the role of individual Sultans in this period. The weaknesses of opponents was not considered enough.
- 9** Most candidates had a sound grasp of what Ferdinand and Isabella's achievements were, and were considered the significance of the conquest of Granada and other achievements. Better answers focused on what 'significance' meant, or took a long-term view of significance, while relatively weaker answers tended to assert that factors were or were not significant without further explanation.
- 11** The best answers not only focused on the appeal of Calvin's theology and church organisation but stepped outside Geneva and discussed the effects of his missionary work in Scotland, the Netherlands and France. Many wrote about Calvinism's role in establishing secular social order, while others about his appeal to rebels. Weaker answers tended to omit any discussion of the theological appeal.
- 12** Answers which had a firm grip of what problems Charles faced, particularly if set out in their introduction, were then able to argue 'how successfully'. The best answers took a balanced view of Charles. Some of these chided the Emperor for his naïve attempts at compromise with the stubborn Luther, and made it clear that princely particularism and the Ottoman and French threats presented him with an impossible task. They pointed out that the Holy Roman Empire survived intact despite the religious split and discussed his confrontation with the princes in the later part of the reign and its consequences. Weaker answers lost sight that this was a question about how successful Charles was in Germany, not a request for his reasons for failing generally.
- 16** Success in this question depended on identifying Philip's foreign policy aims. This led to some well-focused discussions. Those answers which outlined key areas and then made comments about the success or otherwise of aims were less successful. The Enterprise of England was generally handled better than relations with France, while understanding of the situation with Portugal was sometimes vague.
- 19** There were some good answers which demonstrated clear understanding of the contribution made by the Jesuits, and the interrelationship between that and the other factors which contributed to the Counter-Reformation. However, rather than focusing on the question set, a few candidates assessed whether the process could be seen as a Catholic Reformation. Some of these included only a brief paragraph on the Jesuits before considering other factors and without any attempt at comparative judgment.
- 22** Some answers focused solely on marginalised groups – Jews and homosexuals - rather than looking at the wider aspects of the topic. While relevant material was credited, better answers considered 'social change' in a more developed way.

- 26** There were several good answers to the question. Regarding the weaker answers, there were two main problems. Firstly, there was a lack of appreciation of the geography of the persecution (i.e. where it was prevalent and where it was not, and why) and, secondly, the importance of the Reformation as fundamental in creating the context for theological debate. Many candidates also wrote extensively on aspects such as torture and bad weather as main reasons, but these cannot not explain what occurred and why at this particular time.
- 33** Better answers offered balanced arguments and appreciated that some policies succeeded while others had less impact. Some of these were conveyed Peter's energy and sense of experimentation. Some weaker answers did not adequately address 'Given the difficulties he inherited' and described, and to some extent assessed, what Peter did but ignored what came before him. More limited responses agreed that everything he did was remarkable.
- 35** In general, this question was well done as many answers appreciated that Louis IV was motivated both by religion and by secular factors, though most felt the secular trumped the religious. This was often supported by explanations of Louis' quarrel with Innocent XI over regale and in relation to Cologne. On the other hand, his treatment of the Huguenots and Jansenists were seen in a purely religious light.
- 36** A lot of answers failed to consider that the outcome of the War of Spanish Succession was very much determined by what occurred from 1709 onwards: the failure of peace negotiations, the Tories coming to power and Archduke Charles becoming Emperor. Thus, any discussion of the causes of the War and the successes of Marlborough and Prince Eugene in the early years was not strictly relevant. The better answers understood this and, while suggesting that the resources of the maritime powers eventually eclipsed those of France, appreciated that it was the political decisions of the various leaders that really shaped the outcome.
- 37** Most answers argued for 'stability' but no 'reform', and ignored some fiscal reforms and changes to the law. Some responses tried to suggest that Fleury's attack on the Jansenists was reform, but this was tenuous. Some suggested, though not always convincingly, that his pacific foreign policy was a reform given the move away from traditional bellicosity, and it was not always explained that this was a period of political stability. Better answers appreciated Fleury's close relationship with the King and how his opponents thought that being of a great age he would soon expire. They also appreciated that involvement in the War of Austrian Succession at the end of his tenure was uncharacteristic and the result of his loosening grip.
- 40** Responses generally needed to address not only the entire period but also to contrast that period with what had gone before. Considering what 'revival' might mean and especially as to how it might be ascertained led to higher marks. Answers which confined themselves to domestic policy and failed to mention Spain's naval revival and the return to Italy engineered by Elizabeth Farnese were not very successful.
- 41** Many answers did not find many 'redeeming features' in Louis XV's reign and did not consider the art and culture. Responses were often confined to a list of disasters and failures, though better candidates did try to see some positivity in the triumvirate at the end of the reign.
- 42** The key to this question was to demonstrate an understanding of the word 'politics', which has a different meaning to 'policies'. There were some strong answers which considered how one might gauge the extent of success by measuring them against aims, practicalities and circumstances.
- 43** Those answers which showed an awareness of the meaning and implications of the term 'truly enlightened' in the question were able to offer more sustained and meaningful analysis. There was some knowledge of key elements of the reign, but some uncertainty what the term really meant so often answers drifted to an assessment of success or failure, or the degree of change. An understanding of key concepts relating to the period such as 'enlightened' is essential.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/23
European History Outlines,
c. 1700–c. 2000

Key messages

- Make sure that you know the key concepts relevant to the period.
- Read the question carefully and think about its implications.
- Write clearly and legibly using ball point pen.
- Make sure that the information which you include is relevant to the question.
- Give the historian's name when describing their argument.

General comments

There was much detailed and relevant knowledge and argument. Many answers reflected an obvious enthusiasm for the topics and there were many confident judgements offered. The standard of communication was often high with good use of historical vocabulary and some varied and nuanced writing.

Regarding presentation, however, all examiners commented on the increasing problem of illegibility. In some cases, this was so severe that the meaning of some paragraphs was obscured. It is a huge pity when work is compromised as the reader cannot follow the flow of argument and explanation. Regarding the appropriate writing tool, it is a Cambridge International Examinations requirement that candidates use a ballpoint pen. Fountain or roller ball type pens can cause the ink to 'bleed through' the examination booklet paper therefore making writing illegible. Candidates should understand that poor handwriting can make their work difficult, and in some cases impossible, to read.

In terms of academic performance, the main distinction was at the higher end of the mark range between those answers in which an attempt was made to offer sustained and supported judgements in response to the question and those in which a series of supported explanations was presented. Often the quality of the explanations was high but the evaluative essence of questions like 'What best explains...', 'To what extent' or 'How far do you agree...' was not addressed. The different factors were often identified clearly at the start, then explained (with various degrees of support in what was often a structured answer) then reprised in the final paragraph. This did not demonstrate the higher level analytical skills required for the higher mark bands. At the lower end of the mark range, the material deployed was not always used in support of arguments but more for its own sake and the explanations were more like assertions. Better answers saw the implications of the question and took the concept as the starting point then discussed the criteria for success, the extent of success and offered an overview. Weaker responses started with different elements of the reign or different aspects of policy, set them out and then offered a comment on whether they were successful or not. This approach took weaker answers further and further away from the exact terms of the question. For example, analyses of whether the League of Nations was a 'successful experiment ruined by the Great Depression' demands more than an account of the success and failures of the League of Nations. Similarly, if a question asks for more than one element, then prepared lists which focus just on one part will not provide an adequate response. Reliance on prepared answers is a dangerous examination strategy especially where the answer is also factually incorrect, or contains misunderstandings. Every question on the Holocaust does not need a description of the Intentionalist or Structuralist views. Neither do Marxist views of the French Revolution have to be imported, regardless of the question. Another redundant element in some answers was comparison with events in a different period. It is not very helpful to compare Philip II with Mussolini, for instance or Joseph II with Stalin.

When approaching questions, candidates should aim to discuss the main factor first. For example, if a question asks 'How important was insensitive rule from Spain in causing the Dutch revolt ...' there should be substantial consideration of the Spanish rule over the Dutch in the first two, or possibly three pages.

Lastly, candidates should show understanding of the key concepts relevant to the period being studied and know the required specialist vocabulary (which is not extensive). For example, they should understand the different aspects between 'domestic' and 'foreign' policies. Those candidates who have studied the rulers of the later eighteenth century should know what is meant by the term 'enlightened' just as Fascism should be understood by those studying twentieth century Italy.

Some key elements of candidates' responses were very successful. Firstly, most candidates offered three full essays and used their time well. Final responses were not generally weak nor appeared rushed. Though, in comparison with the first two essays attempted, naturally many candidates often did their best answer first. Secondly, answers were generally clearly structured and easy to follow. Thirdly, the quality and variety of language was often high with many telling phrases and clear explanations. Finally, knowledge was often more than adequate with some good detail.

The following comments are offered on questions where there were enough answers to make general trends apparent. It is a pity that there is a relative lack of answers to questions in the Themes sections, but there was a range of questions attempted.

Comments on specific questions

- 8** Better candidates gave adequate attention to the role of the King and dealt with the decisions made in 1789, and were able to compare other factors with this or show the relationship between the King's weaknesses and the problems which he faced. Many answers did not consider Louis XVI's personality beyond stating he was weak. In many cases, his weakness was unconvincingly asserted or justified in terms of his interest in clocks and locks. Better candidates appreciated that there were both short and long-term factors for the Revolution, but some unfortunately ascribed entry into the American War of Independence to Louis XV, thereby exonerating Louis XVI while others made Louis XVI responsible for the Seven Years War. While many mentioned Calonne, few stated what he was trying to do or why he was sacked. Several candidates wrote of the economy when they meant finance, though better candidates made the distinction. Most candidates gave a 'causes of the French Revolution' essay with a paragraph on the Enlightenment which failed to explain either what it was or how it related to the Revolution. The events of 1789 were rarely present. Some candidates had a limited understanding of the role of the *Parlements* and placed undue emphasis on their restoration in blocking reforms. This question elicited a lot of lists and many answers showed limited understanding of the topic. Long consideration of unidentified 'Marxist historians' added little to arguments.
- 9** The best answers were fully focused on Napoleon I's domestic policies and addressed the precise focus of the question to evaluate whether these policies had other intentions and results other than enhancing Napoleon's personal power. They also described issues such as Napoleon's relationship with the Church beyond general notions of increased religious toleration. Some answered in a more restricted way by outlining Napoleon's repressive measures. The Civil Code was often seen as an alternative term for a range of domestic policies.
- 10** This was not a popular question. Successful answers discussed the role of Alexander I across the whole timeframe of the question and offered some analysis of his role in both supporting and then opposing Napoleon before the invasion in 1812, as well as preventing his further expansion into Russia.
- 18** Understanding of 'realistic' was occasionally a little sketchy, but most answers showed a sound understanding of the key points of the reigns of each of these kings (with most being very critical of Charles X). Some responses adopted a monarch-by-monarch approach and then failed to contrast with Charles X. Though there was often some impressive knowledge of Charles X's reign, many seemed unsure who Polignac was or what the Ordinances of St. Cloud said.
- 19** Better answers showed a strong understanding of the processes behind Italian Unification, and the contributions of Mazzini and Cavour were well explained. The best candidates contrasted the impact made by both, while weaker answers tended to devote too much time and exposition to figures or processes other than those two. A few exaggerated Mazzini's influence though better candidates identified his influence over Garibaldi and Crispi. Many candidates failed to point out that unification was not Cavour's aim. Few candidates knew that Plombières was Napoleon's

initiative and many failed to mention the deal over the duchies. The reason for Cavour sending an army south and unifying Italy was rarely explained. Some did not answer the question stating that Italy was not unified in 1861 which, while not untrue in many ways, was not what was asked.

- 20** Most answers were able to write about Austria's weakness, Prussia's strengths, Bismarck's abilities and the growth of nationalism as reasons for unification, with the better ones making a judgment about what was more important. A few mentioned the Danes. Many simply stated France was weak, though better candidates pointed out that France was quite strong but poorly led. There was some tendency to equate 'weaknesses' with 'mistakes'. Some tried to relate the overall diplomatic situation in Europe to 'weakness' but with limited success. What was often missing were Bismarck's internal opponents – the Liberals – and the opposition of the smaller German states in 1866. There was extensive consideration of Bismarck's role which tended in some answers to become overly descriptive. Discussion of economic factors gave considerable prominence to the Zollverein, but few offered much explanation of its links with either unification or the issue in the question.
- 21** Good answers focused clearly on the significance or otherwise of internal weakness and divisions in the failure of the Revolutions of 1848. Candidates who differentiated between different groups within a country, as well as between different countries, could more effectively consider the relative importance of other factors. Unfortunately, many responses offered quite generalised observations without concrete examples; therefore, while it was true that the bourgeoisie's political ambitions took advantage of the lower classes' economic unrest, few could state where and how. Several candidates wrote about France which, given the fact that the monarchy was overthrown, was a successful revolution. Several candidates also might have mentioned Italy where the split between supporters of King Charles Albert and the Milanese and Venetian republicans, and the resolution of Radetsky.
- 22** Responses which distinguished between Bismarck's aims and the 'interests of the German Empire' produced more nuanced analysis, which were therefore worthy of greater reward. Particularly good responses considered how one might measure 'how well' those interests were served. The interests of the German Empire were, however, often simply identified as Bismarck's foreign policy aims. There was more descriptive writing than in many other answers and some omitted the tariffs against the Russians and the foray into colonial policy. Arguments which considered the impact on subsequent policy and blamed Bismarck for the First World War were rarely convincing.
- 23** The best answers addressed both the issue of being 'reckless' and 'incompetent' and considered both domestic issues and foreign policy. Candidates who considered what would count as reckless or incompetent across the time frame, and across a range of policies and actions, were best able to evaluate the validity of the statement. Weaker answers offered too many generalisations about the Kaiser's personality and there was some lack of depth in considering domestic policies.
- 24** Candidates who had a firm grasp of what the different aims of the reforms might have been were better able to assess 'how far' those aims were achieved. A focus on social, economic and political reforms led to a broader range than those who concentrated on constitutionalism alone.
- 25** Italy's problems between 1871 and 1914 were clearly defined by the best answers in order to weigh up the extent to which poor leadership was responsible. Candidates who addressed the whole of the time frame, including a range of leaders and issues, were more likely to be able to reach an effective judgement on 'how far'. Some responses were weakened by failure to identify any leaders. To answer this question, some discussion of Depretis, Crispi and particularly Giolitti is essential. Often 'poor leadership' was referred to in general terms. Surveys of problems were often generalisations about divisions and with a tendency to see the period as static, ignoring economic, social and political developments.
- 26** This was not a popular topic. Answers which set out what 'challenges' there were to the 'survival' of the Third Republic were more likely to produce essays which focused on the causes of its survival. Weaker answers omitted the first two decades and were sometimes unsure of the chronological order of the crises concerning Boulanger, Panama and Dreyfus.
- 23** Successful answers to this question focused on the issue of the impact of the weaknesses of Germany's allies and were able to develop what these were in order to evaluate to what extent they determined the outcome of the First World War. To reach a clear judgement and overall evaluation of this specific question, it was necessary to discuss the impact of the failings of a range of

Germany's allies (a major proportion of the answer), as well as considering a range of other factors. Weaker answers dismissed the key factor and offered a series of explanations often going back to 1914, with little sense of discrimination and often variable factual support.

- 34** This was not a popular question. Candidates were aware of the work of the League of Nations in the Twenties and most agreed with the statement. However, much argument was based on the contrast between the limited success before the Wall Street Crash and the failure thereafter, without consideration of whether these can be attributed to the impact of the Great Depression.
- 35** There were some sustained discussion about the relative importance of the Bolsheviks' own strengths and the weaknesses of their enemies. Better answers dealt with both aspects and those which addressed the impact of the weaknesses of the Bolsheviks' enemies, for both gaining and retaining power across the time frame, were able to judge how far this was the main factor. Weaker answers offered less balanced treatment and answers sometimes became a list of reasons for Bolshevik victory in the Civil War, with slight treatment of the key issue and a lot about Lenin and Trotsky.
- 36** There were some insightful responses which considered the degree to which pre-War policies and actions had determined the extreme nature of persecution and the extent to which the circumstances of war accelerated radicalism. Better answers looked at the evidence and sustained some strong discussions while weaker answers relied on descriptions of schools of thought. Weaker answers also offered historiographical digests or limited descriptions of persecution. There was often considerable knowledge of developments before 1939 but the events after that, aside from Wannsee, were less well known and assessed.
- 37** Better answers had firm understanding of the key elements of Fascism, though ideology was somewhat neglected and, as is common with answers on this topic, the Corporate State could have been fully discussed. Most answers needed a more direct weighing up of a range of measures during Mussolini's rule, across a range of organisations and sections of society, economics and government, to consider the extent to which he had genuinely instilled Fascism in Italy.
- 39** Most answers were narrative accounts of events in the period and its uprisings without much assessment of why the USSR was able to control Eastern Europe. There was, therefore, implicit analysis along the lines of 'Russia was more powerful' but other factors were rarely considered. There was excessive treatment of the reasons for unrest in some responses. Some answers did not treat the whole period.
- 42** This question tended to attract descriptions of the events in Berlin without considering why Germany was important. Though the level of knowledge was often sound, there was some confusion in weaker answers about the sequence of events and the building of the Berlin Wall.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/03
United States History Outlines,
c. 1750–c. 2005

Key messages

- Make sure that you know the key concepts relevant to the period.
- Read the question carefully and think about its implications.
- Write clearly and legibly using ball point pen.
- Make sure that the information which you include is relevant to the question.
- Give the historian's name when describing their argument.

General comments

Many comments made on the English Outlines paper are applicable to this paper.

There was much impressive knowledge and argument and, in general, answers were better supported this year. Many answers reflected an obvious enthusiasm for the topics and there were many confident judgements offered. The standard of communication was often high with good use of historical vocabulary and some varied and nuanced writing.

Regarding presentation, however, all examiners commented on the increasing problem of illegibility. In some cases, this was so severe that the meaning of some paragraphs was obscured. It is a huge pity when work is compromised as the reader cannot follow the flow of argument and explanation. Regarding the appropriate writing tool, it is a Cambridge International Examinations requirement that candidates use a ballpoint pen. Fountain or roller ball type pens can cause the ink to 'bleed through' the examination booklet paper therefore making writing illegible. Candidates should understand that poor handwriting can make their work difficult, and in some cases impossible, to read.

In terms of academic performance, the main distinction was at the higher end of the mark range between those answers in which an attempt was made to offer sustained and supported judgements in response to the question and those in which a series of supported explanations was presented. Often the quality of the explanations was high but the evaluative essence of questions like 'What best explains...', 'To what extent' or 'How far do you agree...' was not addressed. The different factors were often identified clearly at the start, then explained (with various degrees of support in what was often a structured answer) then reprised in the final paragraph. This did not demonstrate the higher level analytical skills required for the higher mark bands. At the lower end of the mark range, the material deployed was not always used in support of arguments but more for its own sake and the explanations were more like assertions. Better answers saw the implications of the question and took the concept as the starting point then discussed the criteria for success, the extent of success and offered an overview. Weaker responses started with different elements of the reign or different aspects of policy, set them out and then offered a comment on whether they were successful or not. This approach took weaker answers further and further away from the exact terms of the question. For example, in analyses of US foreign policy 1920–1941, the focus on the key concept of 'continuity' was sometimes applied within answers to a question in which it had not been asked (such as 'how isolationist was US foreign policy?' or 'how successful was foreign policy?') These answers were written without sufficient thought to the exact question which had been asked. Reliance on prepared answers is a dangerous examination strategy, especially where the answer is also actually factually incorrect, or contains misunderstandings.

Lastly, candidates should show understanding of the key concepts relevant to the period being studied and know the required specialist vocabulary (which is not extensive). For example, an important concept like 'Manifest Destiny' should be seen as distinct from a general desire for expansion and 'turning point' should be understood as being different from 'explanation'.

Some key elements of candidates' responses were very successful. Firstly, most candidates offered three full essays and used their time well. Final responses were not generally weak nor appeared rushed. Though, in comparison with the first two essays attempted, naturally many candidates often did their best answer first. Secondly, answers were generally clearly structured and easy to follow. Thirdly, the quality and variety of language was often high with many telling phrases and clear explanations. Finally, knowledge was often more than adequate with some good detail.

The following comments are offered on questions where there were enough answers to make general trends apparent. It is a pity that there is a relative lack of answers to questions in the Themes sections, but there was a range of questions attempted. In particular, it was encouraging that centres took the opportunity to go beyond very familiar topics to study a wide range of US History.

Comments on specific questions

- 1 This was a popular question and most answers focused adequately on taxation and were able to suggest other possible factors. Better responses explored the issues behind taxation and many questioned whether, in itself, it was significant enough to be the main cause, seeing the links to other causes of opposition. There was, however, a wider coverage of the growth of opposition than has sometimes been the case in the past with this topic. Some responses did not go much beyond 1770, or even 1767.
- 3 Many answers did not really engage with the key idea of the question and explained why Britain lost rather more than how close it came to victory. This illustrates the importance of taking time to consider the demands of the question rather than re-writing an answer to a question on the same topic but with a different focus. Successful answers balanced the problems faced by Britain in fighting a war so far from home with some of the problems faced by the colonial leaders to reach a balanced judgement. Those who showed flexibility in using their knowledge achieved higher marks than those who were more concerned to write down a list of factors.
- 4 This question was answered with a considerable variety of responses. The better answers engaged with the concepts of 'property rights' and 'liberties' which are key to understanding historical analysis of the Constitution. Less developed responses were more concerned with 'liberties' and assessed how far this was safeguarded by the checks and balances of the Constitution. Weaker answers either described some key features of the Constitution, sometimes describing its genesis, or failed to go much beyond a discussion of slavery.
- 5 Most responses explained various factors, and the best made insightful analysis of the whole about period to 1825, offering some explanation of why the relations were 'so strained' and giving a view about the relative importance of different disputes. It was a feature of weaker responses to leave most of the post-1812 period unexplained. Some weaker responses offered relatively little beyond comments about the legacy of British 'tyranny' under George III.
- 6 At their best, responses established criteria against which to measure the effectiveness of abolitionists and charted the successes and failures of a variety of groups and individual activists. Some answers limited themselves to the Republican Party and to Lincoln. It would have been helpful for some responses to have included assessment of the reception of anti-slavery literature, beyond unsupported claims that certain well-known diaries or novels were 'very influential'.

- 8** Stronger responses questioned the inevitability of the decisions of the Deep South and produced some strong analysis showing that not all slave states seceded and that Lincoln was not elected on the ticket of abolishing slavery where it existed. There was some good discussion of both whether the South had suffered from discrimination in the years since 1854 which gave it no option but to leave the Union, and the gap between the perception of many of its leaders and the realities of the situation. However, the precise terms of this question were not addressed by weaker answers which offered an explanation of the events that led to the secession or general causes of sectional conflict.
- 9** Many candidates focused on geographical and logistical matters. Better answers were characterised by detailed understanding of decisions made by key figures on both sides, on campaigns and strategies, as well as on issues like popular support. Some answers focused too much on explaining why the South lost, showing again the dangers of repeating previously written essays rather than looking carefully at what the question demands.
- 10** Most answers offered some analysis of 'quality' though weaker responses soon swung away from this to a consideration of policies or lengthy comparisons with the inadequacies of Jefferson Davis. There was some good knowledge of Lincoln's political qualities and his management of different personalities in his cabinet. However, there were some overly general definitions of qualities a president might possess
- 11** Better answers showed a close reading of the question and explained its attraction, going beyond its importance as one element in explaining westward expansion. Some answers did not have a very well-defined grasp of the concept of 'Manifest Destiny', equating it simply with expansion and sometimes restricting the scope of the answer to overseas territorial acquisitions. In general, answers would have benefited from more analysis of how and why it appealed to the various interests of settlers.
- 12** Better responses struck a balance between simple greed and exploitation often accompanied by violence and genuine attempts, albeit misguided, to 'civilise' and develop Native Americans. Weaker responses tended to be over-generalised, failing to draw much distinction between different periods or regions and being over descriptive in dealing with examples of exploitation.
- 20** Some strong responses explored what might have been meant by 'great imperial power' questioning whether the US pursued, in comparison with other empires, genuine imperialism. There was also some consideration of greatness both in terms of extent and also of achievement. Weaker answers offered accounts of expansion overseas with comments on whether this did or did not amount to establishing an empire without much definition of the term.
- 22** Good responses balanced the treatment of the different elements in the question but, generally, the treatment of the US importance in the First World War was somewhat neglected and generalised. Better answers focused on the potential contribution, noting that the actual fighting done was somewhat limited as a factor bringing about the allies' victory. Weaker answers did not offer very developed or balanced judgements.
- 23** Better answers defined the economic problems and conveyed an understanding of what was possible, in policy terms, given the constraints operating at the time. Weaker answers did not make the economic problems the starting point but dealt with different elements of the New Deal, often describing some key elements and offering some comments about success or failure. In general though, analysis was offered and there was understanding of the strengths and limitations of the measures, even though the period was too often treated as a whole.
- 24** Most candidates weighed up the balance between isolationist versus internationalist tendencies in US foreign policy during the period 1920-1941. However, that approach sometimes replaced a sustained focus on 'consistency' which was the main demand of the question. There were many creditable attempts to cover the whole period, and some well-balanced analysis of elements which remained consistent and those which showed change. However, too often, the vital later part of the period was unaccountably neglected, and the discussion came to an end as early as 1935 with very limited consideration of US policy towards Japan or the European war before 1941. This has been a common feature of answers on this topic, it is important that events at the end of the period specified in a question of this type are not being neglected by over detailed consideration of some elements earlier on.

- 25** The better answers combined mastery of detail with assessment of relative significance and were able to offer coherent thesis though answers to this question sometimes lacked depth in support to their arguments. Some answers did not go much beyond bombing in Europe and sometimes did not consider the war in the Pacific very much at all. Many answers compared air power with the economic power of the US, but the infantry, as at the time, were rather neglected and undervalued.
- 26** Some strong answers engaged in thoughtful discussion of matters such as ‘the paranoid style’ in American politics, applying it to the 1943–1953 period. There were some good judgements about the relative importance of different elements, and it was encouraging that the range of factors was much stronger than in previous answers on this general topic, with less focus on a single issue like McCarthyism. However, there was some confusion about when McCarthyism was rampant – and a consensus that the tactics of the Truman administration were to blame for the increasing fear that was not always justified by the evidence presented.
- 27** Some strong answers covered the period and offered a balanced analysis rather than just a ‘one way’ criticism of Cold War policy. The term ‘persistent’ was insufficiently addressed in many in responses to this question. Answers tended to focus on Korea and Berlin, to the detriment of Hungary, Egypt, Guatemala and Vietnam.
- 28** There was evidence of good knowledge and understanding of the Tet Offensive in answers.. Many of those who disagreed with the statement offered alternative turning points. Less developed responses tended to explain the significance of the Offensive then produce a list of other factors rather than turning points as such. This illustrated the importance of understanding key historical concepts like ‘turning point’.
- 29** Good answers conveyed understanding of the core legislation and reached judgements on its effectiveness. There was some good use made of statistical indices. The best responses explained how race and inequality combined in this matter of poverty, whereas other, less successful answers, tended to drift into a general account of Johnson’s domestic policy, failing to relate knowledge about Civil Rights to the question.
- 30** Candidates who focused largely on the 1970s often produced some strong explanations and were rewarded appropriately. Some answers dealt with the 1980s, but the key distinction was whether there was any attempt to deal with the relative importance of the reasons and thus address ‘what best explains’ rather than just what explains. Better answers offered some distinction between the different factors.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/04

African and Asian History Outlines,
c. 1760–c. 2000

Key messages

- Make sure that you know the key concepts relevant to the period.
- Read the question carefully and think about its implications.
- Write clearly and legibly using ball point pen.
- Make sure that the information which you include is relevant to the question.
- Give the historian's name when describing their argument.

General comments

Many comments made on the English Outlines paper are applicable to this paper.

There was much impressive knowledge and argument and, in general, answers were better supported this year. Many answers reflected an obvious enthusiasm for the topics and there were many confident judgements offered. The standard of communication was often high with good use of historical vocabulary and some varied and nuanced writing.

Regarding presentation, however, all examiners commented on the increasing problem of illegibility. In some cases, this was so severe that the meaning of some paragraphs was obscured. It is a huge pity when work is compromised as the reader cannot follow the flow of argument and explanation. Regarding the appropriate writing tool, it is a Cambridge International Examinations requirement that candidates use a ballpoint pen. Fountain or roller ball type pens can cause the ink to 'bleed through' the examination booklet paper therefore making writing illegible. Candidates should understand that poor handwriting can make their work difficult, and in some cases impossible, to read.

In terms of academic performance, the main distinction was at the higher end of the mark range between those answers in which an attempt was made to offer sustained and supported judgements in response to the question and those in which a series of supported explanations was presented. Often the quality of the explanations was high but the evaluative essence of questions like 'What best explains...', 'To what extent' or 'How far do you agree...' was not addressed. The different factors were often identified clearly at the start, then explained (with various degrees of support in what was often a structured answer) then reprised in the final paragraph. This did not demonstrate the higher level analytical skills required for the higher mark bands. At the lower end of the mark range, the material deployed was not always used in support of arguments but more for its own sake and the explanations were more like assertions. Better answers saw the implications of the question and took the concept as the starting point then discussed the criteria for success, the extent of success and offered an overview. Weaker responses started with different elements of the reign or different aspects of policy, set them out and then offered a comment on whether they were successful or not. This approach took weaker answers further and further away from the exact terms of the question. For example, in analyses of whether Japan could possibly win the war it started in 1941, the focus often shifted to 'why did Japan lose?' or even a description of some of the events in the war. The suspicion was that these answers had been done previously and that previous responses were being presented without sufficient thought to the exact question which had been asked. Reliance on prepared answers is a dangerous examination strategy, especially where the answer is also actually factually incorrect, or contains misunderstandings.

Lastly, candidates should show understanding of the key concepts relevant to the period being studied and know the required specialist vocabulary (which is not extensive). For example, a term such as 'Meiji Restoration' should be understood by those studying nineteenth century Japan in the same way that 'The Restoration' should be understood by students of Stuart England.

Some key elements of candidates' responses should be singled out for praise. Firstly, most candidates offered three full essays and appeared to have used their time well. Final responses were not generally weak nor appeared rushed. Though, in comparison with the first two essays attempted, naturally candidates often did their best answer first. Secondly, answers were generally clearly structured and easy to follow. Thirdly, the quality and variety of language was often high with many telling phrases and clear explanations. Finally, knowledge was often more than adequate with some good detail.

The following comments are offered only on questions where there were enough answers to make general trends apparent. The relative lack of answers to questions outside Japan, China and India remains a matter of regret as the rewards of studying African and Southeast Asian history are considerable.

Comments on specific questions

There were no answers to **questions 1–16**.

- 17** Broadly, answers fell into two categories – those which addressed the general issue of foreign influence in China and those which offered a more focused analysis of the period 1895–1911. The question asked about the continuation of influence but the focus was on the later period. Better answers offered specific analysis of different factors and were able to make some distinction between the explanations. There were some perceptive answers and some interesting analysis of the impact of modernisation increasing not decreasing Western influence.
- 18** It was essential that answers identified the hopes of the supporters of change. Without identifying these, answers tended to be a list of problems that the Republic faced with a few comments that hopes were therefore disappointed. Better responses went beyond this and achieved some balanced analysis – for all the problems, there was some fulfilment of hopes and not all the supporters of Revolution hoped for the same things. For many, freedom from foreign domination was more important than constitutional change. Pre-prepared lists of 'consequences of 1911' achieved less success than answers which were more firmly focused on this particular question.
- 19** Better answers focused on 'survival' and not just general 'support' or strengths. Weaker answers did not show much understanding of the pressure that the Chinese Communist Party was under in this period. There was appreciation that the policy towards the peasants was important and there were other factors explained in most essays. Oddly, the Long March was not always considered and there was the impression that some answers were trying to adapt previous essays written on 'reasons for Communist Success in 1949'.
- 20** There was an understanding of the requirements of the question within most answers, but the significance of the dates in the question was not always grasped. Many argued that changes in the countryside came at the cost of considerable violence, and that controls and the direction of the economy had their costs as well as ensuring progress. Better answers considered the implications of 'progress' as seen in terms of Maoist ideology as opposed to other criteria. Weaker responses drifted into developments after 1957, or even general policies not all linked to the economy.
- 23** On the whole, there was not sufficient understanding of 'British responses' or coverage of the whole period. The term 'well-meaning' was not always understood: for example, the Amritsar Massacre was seen by some as 'well-meaning' because the aim was to preserve British control. The important developments in the 1930s were often neglected.
- 27** The term 'Meiji Restoration' was often interpreted as 'the reforms of the Meiji period'. These changes are dealt with in books under this heading, but with the tacit understanding that the results of the Meiji Restoration are being considered. The question was focused on why the direct rule of the Emperor was restored. There were some outstanding answers which focused appropriately and had highly impressive subject knowledge and understanding. However, lists of changes made as a result of the Restoration did not score highly.

- 28** There were few strong answers here and there was little understanding of why Manchuria was 'so important' or coverage of the whole period. Most did not go beyond a somewhat limited treatment of the events of 1931 and filled out the answer with general accounts of Japanese nationalist unrest after 1918.
- 29** There were some very good answers which grasped the point of the question and offered some balanced analysis. There was a consideration of the balance of probabilities faced by Japan in 1941 and some understanding of the point of view that victory might be possible, if the initial attacks were decisive enough and the European powers and the USA were sufficiently distracted by the war in Europe. Most thought this was overly optimistic and showed a lack of understanding of the scale of US economic power and national determination. Weaker answers saw this as a chance to offer, or perhaps reproduce, explanations on 'why Japan lost' without considering the demands and implications of the question.

There were too few response to **questions 30–42** for a report to be written.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/52
Special Subject: The Crusades,
1095–1192

Key messages

- In **question 1(a)**, use evidence from the passages to support your comparisons and contrasts.
- In **question 1(b)**, use your knowledge of the context.
- Remember to give a judgement if the question asks for it.
- Use documents to support your analysis where possible.

General comments

There was some good understanding of the documents shown.

In **Question 1(a)**, there were some quite generalised comments on how the two documents did not support each other. References were made to the nature and context of the documents, but not always used to explain similarity and/or difference.

Most answers to **Question 1(b)** were firmly focused on the documents rather than merely referencing the texts. However, it is important when offering analysis of similarities and differences that the documents are used to support comparisons and contrasts and that their contents are examined closely. There was often a good interpretation of aspects of the documents, but some answers considered the texts as a whole and some more than others. The requirement for the use of contextual knowledge was not always met. Some answers relied too heavily on just explaining the documents without assessing them enough by the application of contextual knowledge. Opportunities to consider the purpose and nature of the documents were not always taken.

There are three requirements for candidates tackling **Question 1(b)**. The first is to interpret the documents in the light of the issue in the question, and thus identify how they might be used in response to the understanding of that issue and to make a judgement about the issue. The second is to consider the interpretation identified in the light of contextual knowledge which might confirm or challenge the evidence in the documents. Therefore, if a document appears to offer evidence that Communist success depended on military power, does that seem convincing in the light of what is known of the context of the period? The third requirement is to look at the nature of the evidence and to take into account various elements concerning provenance which might affect a decision on how well the document offers evidence for a particular view about the issue in the question. This will depend a lot on contextual understanding. There is a requirement in the question that candidates use contextual knowledge. If candidates rely just on the use of documents, they will not be able to gain full marks in the higher band marks. There is also a requirement to treat the documents as a set and so offer an overall review of the interpretations. Linking those which offer complementary evidence is a sound way of demonstrating this requirement, but each document must be treated fully and its evidence assessed. Therefore, answers should not be essays which use extracts from the texts, but rather they should be fully focused on the documents themselves in keeping with the nature of the first part of the paper which is document based.

In **Section B**, overall the responses often showed good understanding of the issues involved and were related to the issues raised in the questions. Many responses were well informed and relevant, but few candidates made much use of any documents studied in the course though this should be a detailed study. Special Subject essays were often not much more detailed or able to use source material than essays in the Outlines papers. Though specified as a requirement in the question, many responses did not offer a judgement and or an explanation of the different factors relating to the question. Awareness of primary evidence would increase the depth of essay answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Stronger answers focused entirely on Saladin and saw that his military ability was recognised in both documents, although otherwise they largely differed. These responses appreciated that the differences could largely be explained by the authorship and the motives of each writer. Weaker answers did not always confine their comparison to Saladin but made general points, for example noting that Document C did not contain references to the military orders. Some of these responses did not go beyond a comparison of content.
- (b) There were some strong answers to this question, grouping the documents sensibly and noticing that some of them were more nuanced than simply supporting or challenging the view in the question. All the documents except Document E were used to support the argument that Saladin was the greatest threat, but only the strongest answers used Document C well, suggesting that the picture that emerged of Saladin as a wise and popular ruler showed he was a threat. The most usual alternative view advanced by stronger answers was that disunity was a problem. These responses saw that Document A supported this view by praising Muslim unity, and that Document D and Document E specifically stated it was a problem. A further alternative interpretation was the lack of religious zeal and the consequent shortage of Christian fighters which weakened the Crusader States as highlighted by William of Tyre. Weaker answers often included too much contextual knowledge, such as putting forward other explanations, whereas such knowledge needed to be used to evaluate the factors in the documents. Some of their comments on the provenance of the documents did not advance beyond the formulaic.

Question 2

Strong responses began with an assessment of what Jerusalem meant to the First Crusaders and thus explained why its recapture was so important. Some of these responses linked this effectively with the papal appeal at Clermont, and showed how the original enthusiasm was rekindled by factors such as the finding of the Holy Lance and the fasting before the final assault. The answers were then able to go on to assess other motivations, such as the hope of gain, usually quoting Bohemond as a prime example and the unfavourable conditions in Europe for many. Some weaker responses digressed into a discussion of how far the Pope hoped to revive his power by encouraging the Crusade, but this was hardly a motivating factor for Crusaders as a whole. In weaker answers, the weighing up of the factors tended to be in rather simplistic terms and the medieval belief in remission of sins through a Crusade was not fully understood.

Question 3

This was a popular question with some strong answers. Most responses knew both who the military leaders were and the kind of tactics they employed. They were thus able to assess the importance of this factor using a good range of evidence. Most of these responses then weighed up this factor against the disunity of the Muslims, again with good knowledge in support, and the part played by the determination of the Crusaders, urged on by their beliefs. Conclusions varied about which factor was the vital one but were usually soundly argued. One common argument used by these answers was that the rise of Saladin and the ensuing pulling together of the Muslims led to the defeat of the Christians. Weaker responses were often descriptive or lacked much knowledge to back up the points they were trying to make. Some fastened on particular examples like the siege of Antioch to demonstrate military leadership and then neglected other aspects.

Question 4

This was easily the least popular of the three essay questions and few strong responses were seen. Most answers were able to assess Bernard's place in the origins of the Crusade, which he championed so determinedly, but were more challenged about his part thereafter. The alternative given view was that events like the fall of Edessa and the influence of the Pope also led to the Crusade, and that figures such as Louis VII and the rising power of the Muslims were far more important in deciding its course. Less strong answers described Bernard's preaching tour and its impact, and had little else to add.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/53
Special Subject: The Reign of
Henry VIII, 1509-1547

Key messages

- In **question 1(a)**, use evidence from the passages to support your comparisons and contrasts.
- In **question 1(b)**, use your knowledge of the context.
- Remember to give a judgement if the question asks for it.
- Use documents to support your analysis where possible.

General comments

There was some good understanding of the documents shown.

In **Question 1(a)**, there were some quite generalised comments on how the two documents did not support each other. References were made to the nature and context of the documents, but not always used to explain similarity and/or difference.

Most answers to **Question 1(b)** were firmly focused on the documents rather than merely referencing the texts. However, it is important when offering analysis of similarities and differences that the documents are used to support comparisons and contrasts and that their contents are examined closely. There was often a good interpretation of aspects of the documents, but some answers considered the texts as a whole and some more than others. The requirement for the use of contextual knowledge was not always met. Some answers relied too heavily on just explaining the documents without assessing them enough by the application of contextual knowledge. Opportunities to consider the purpose and nature of the documents were not always taken.

There are three requirements for candidates tackling **Question 1(b)**. The first is to interpret the documents in the light of the issue in the question, and thus identify how they might be used in response to the understanding of that issue and to make a judgement about the issue. The second is to consider the interpretation identified in the light of contextual knowledge which might confirm or challenge the evidence in the documents. Therefore, if a document appears to offer evidence that Communist success depended on military power, does that seem convincing in the light of what is known of the context of the period? The third requirement is to look at the nature of the evidence and to take into account various elements concerning provenance which might affect a decision on how well the document offers evidence for a particular view about the issue in the question. This will depend a lot on contextual understanding. There is a requirement in the question that candidates use contextual knowledge. If candidates rely just on the use of documents, they will not be able to gain full marks in the higher band marks. There is also a requirement to treat the documents as a set and so offer an overall review of the interpretations. Linking those which offer complementary evidence is a sound way of demonstrating this requirement, but each document must be treated fully and its evidence assessed. Therefore, answers should not be essays which use extracts from the texts, but rather they should be fully focused on the documents themselves in keeping with the nature of the first part of the paper which is document based.

In **Section B**, overall the responses often showed good understanding of the issues involved and were related to the issues raised in the questions. Many responses were well informed and relevant, but few candidates made much use of any documents studied in the course though this should be a detailed study. Special Subject essays were often not much more detailed or able to use source material than essays in the Outlines papers. Though specified as a requirement in the question, many responses did not offer a judgement and or an explanation of the different factors relating to the question. Awareness of primary evidence would increase the depth of essay answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Candidates were generally able to assess that the sources showed good relations had existed between Anne Boleyn and Wolsey in the past, and that Wolsey had been active in trying to secure the divorce (Document A). However, when relations broke down, Wolsey was blamed for failure (Document B). Many candidates explained the differences in terms of the collapse of the Blackfriars Trial in July 1529 and Anne Boleyn's subsequent anger at Wolsey, as well as the disappointment Anne felt at failing to arrange the annulment. Some candidates focused more on the divorce rather than relations between Anne Boleyn and Wolsey *per se*.
- (b) Candidates generally gave well-organised answers to this question. They analysed the extent to which Wolsey was responsible and the contribution of other factors that led to him losing the King's favour in 1529. The issue of the divorce was used to support both opinions with the best answers using their contextual knowledge to explain the wider international and diplomatic context, as well as Henry's insistence on using his theological argument. Document A and Document B were used with some discussion of the different dates. While Document C was used to challenge the view in the question, with quite a few candidates acknowledging that Cavendish was likely to be favourable to Wolsey, though this was rarely explained with enough depth and clarity. Document D was widely used to support the case of Wolsey's arrogance being to blame, with typically critical comments on the reliability of the source as evidence against Wolsey. The details of the document could have been used more effectively than they were. Candidates were sometimes too quick to discount it. Document E was used to support both views, but the details were not quoted as fully as they could have been especially the key role of Henry VIII that Scarisbrick emphasised. Comments on Scarisbrick's Catholic sympathies undermining his objectivity gained no credit.

Question 2

There was consideration of doctrinal matters. Many responses tended to list the evidence for continuity and change fairly efficiently when answering this question, with much discussion about the extent that reformed ideas came into England with the English Bible, the dissolution of the Monasteries and the Royal Supremacy, while emphasising the conservative reaction after 1540 and the continuity in the practice of chantry chapels and transubstantiation. Some answers became descriptive rather than analytical, or concentrated too much on details, and in some cases more discussion could have been undertaken of the wording of the question and defining what 'Catholicism' actually meant in the 1530s and 1540s.

Question 3

There was some general discussion of the Elton thesis and its critics, but answers discussed the Privy Council, the development of Crown financial institutions and Parliament's changing role. Weaker answers tended to describe what Cromwell did rather than assess the extent of his contribution, though some responses counter-argued that Cromwell's work was less innovative or effective than Elton had argued. Some answers, particularly on the Privy Council, looked into future developments rather than the 1530s thereby losing some focus.

Question 4

Many answers showed good understanding of Henry's foreign policy through the role in the Reformation of the 1530s and the wars with Scotland and France in the 1540s. Answers were generally negative, though an attempt to be more positive about the wars would have added some balance, as the way Foreign Policy particularly helped Henry negotiate his domestic religious policy in the 1530s. Some answers found the analysis of such a broad time range a challenge and so failed to establish a strong analytical structure and, instead, were more of a chronological survey that was less effective.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/54

Special Subject: Reformation Europe,
1516–1559

Key messages

- In **question 1(a)**, use evidence from the passages to support your comparisons and contrasts.
- In **question 1(b)**, use your knowledge of the context.
- Remember to give a judgement if the question asks for it.
- Use documents to support your analysis where possible.

General comments

There was some good understanding of the documents shown.

In **Question 1(a)**, there were some quite generalised comments on how the two documents did not did support each other. References were made to the nature and context of the documents, but not always used to explain similarity and/or difference.

Most answers to **Question 1(b)** were firmly focused on the documents rather than merely referencing the texts. However, it is important when offering analysis of similarities and differences that the documents are used to support comparisons and contrasts and that their contents are examined closely. There was often a good interpretation of aspects of the documents, but some answers considered the texts as a whole and some more than others. The requirement for the use of contextual knowledge was not always met. Some answers relied too heavily on just explaining the documents without assessing them enough by the application of contextual knowledge. Opportunities to consider the purpose and nature of the documents were not always taken.

There are three requirements for candidates tackling **Question 1(b)**. The first is to interpret the documents in the light of the issue in the question, and thus identify how they might be used in response to the understanding of that issue and to make a judgement about the issue. The second is to consider the interpretation identified in the light of contextual knowledge which might confirm or challenge the evidence in the documents. Therefore, if a document appears to offer evidence that Communist success depended on military power, does that seem convincing in the light of what is known of the context of the period? The third requirement is to look at the nature of the evidence and to take into account various elements concerning provenance which might affect a decision on how well the document offers evidence for a particular view about the issue in the question. This will depend a lot on contextual understanding. There is a requirement in the question that candidates use contextual knowledge. If candidates rely just on the use of documents, they will not be able gain full marks in the higher band marks. There is also a requirement to treat the documents as a set and so offer an overall review of the interpretations. Linking those which offer complementary evidence is a sound way of demonstrating this requirement, but each document must be treated fully and its evidence assessed. Therefore, answers should not be essays which use extracts from the texts, but rather they should be fully focused on the documents themselves in keeping with the nature of the first part of the paper which is document based.

In **Section B**, overall the responses often showed good understanding of the issues involved and were related to the issues raised in the questions. Many responses were well informed and relevant, but few candidates made much use of any documents studied in the course though this should be a detailed study. Special Subject essays were often not much more detailed or able to use source material than essays in the Outlines papers. Though specified as a requirement in the question, many responses did not offer a judgement and or an explanation of the different factors relating to the question. Awareness of primary evidence would increase the depth of essay answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Stronger responses confined themselves to comparing the aims of the humanists, and showed that the documents agreed that the study of classical languages in order to improve understanding of the Bible was an aim. These answers argued that the main contrast came in the aim of Document C to return to the ways of the Early Church, while the main aim in Document A was for the Pope and a Council to produce a sound version of the Bible. Strong answers explained these differences from the authorship and the dates. Most knew who Erasmus was but Lefèvre d'Étaples was less well-known. Weaker answers made a general comparison between the two documents with little focus on the question and made little use of the provenance.
- (b) There were few strong answers to this question, but those which did understand the documents were able to use them effectively. They recognised in particular that it was the Pope who would call a Council of the Church and, therefore, those documents which argued for this were of the view that papal reform was the best way forward. They used Document D and Document E to show how there was an urgent need for reform starting from the leadership of the Church. They suggested that the one dissenting document was Document C, which wanted reform of the Church in a general way. Less strong answers found Document D a challenge as they argued that Pole wanted reform through the cardinals rather than the Pope, and some did not see that the document came from the period of the Council of Trent. Some of these answers suggested that the Pope was such an obstacle to reform that it had to take place without him, which was not a view derived from the documents. There was not much contextual knowledge in these answers

Question 2

Stronger answers to this question had some understanding of what the constitution of the Empire was and explained its deficiencies, such as the power of the Electors and other Princes and the difficulties in getting decisions from a Diet. They then analysed some other problems which Charles V faced in governing the Empire. They described these problems as mostly arising from the challenges he faced from the Lutheran Princes and from the need to defend the Empire from the Turks, and later from France in alliance with his other enemies. Weaker answers had little to say beyond generalisations about the 'constitution' and some did not seem confident using the term. They often argued that Charles' absence made the Empire difficult to govern, without considering the measures he put in place for absentee rule and especially the role of his brother, Ferdinand. Some deviated into an assessment of how successful Charles was as Holy Roman Emperor and began with an account of his election in 1519. Such responses were not adequately focused on the question set.

Question 3

There were no responses to this question.

Question 4

There were no responses to this question.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/55
Special Subject: The Reign of
Charles 1, 1625–1649

Key messages

- In **question 1(a)**, use evidence from the passages to support your comparisons and contrasts.
- In **question 1(b)**, use your knowledge of the context.
- Remember to give a judgement if the question asks for it.
- Use documents to support your analysis where possible.

General comments

There was some good understanding of the documents shown.

In **Question 1(a)**, there were some quite generalised comments on how the two documents did not support each other. References were made to the nature and context of the documents, but not always used to explain similarity and/or difference.

Most answers to **Question 1(b)** were firmly focused on the documents rather than merely referencing the texts. However, it is important when offering analysis of similarities and differences that the documents are used to support comparisons and contrasts and that their contents are examined closely. There was often a good interpretation of aspects of the documents, but some answers considered the texts as a whole and some more than others. The requirement for the use of contextual knowledge was not always met. Some answers relied too heavily on just explaining the documents without assessing them enough by the application of contextual knowledge. Opportunities to consider the purpose and nature of the documents were not always taken.

There are three requirements for candidates tackling **Question 1(b)**. The first is to interpret the documents in the light of the issue in the question, and thus identify how they might be used in response to the understanding of that issue and to make a judgement about the issue. The second is to consider the interpretation identified in the light of contextual knowledge which might confirm or challenge the evidence in the documents. Therefore, if a document appears to offer evidence that Communist success depended on military power, does that seem convincing in the light of what is known of the context of the period? The third requirement is to look at the nature of the evidence and to take into account various elements concerning provenance which might affect a decision on how well the document offers evidence for a particular view about the issue in the question. This will depend a lot on contextual understanding. There is a requirement in the question that candidates use contextual knowledge. If candidates rely just on the use of documents, they will not be able to gain full marks in the higher band marks. There is also a requirement to treat the documents as a set and so offer an overall review of the interpretations. Linking those which offer complementary evidence is a sound way of demonstrating this requirement, but each document must be treated fully and its evidence assessed. Therefore, answers should not be essays which use extracts from the texts, but rather they should be fully focused on the documents themselves in keeping with the nature of the first part of the paper which is document based.

In **Section B**, overall the responses often showed good understanding of the issues involved and were related to the issues raised in the questions. Many responses were well informed and relevant, but few candidates made much use of any documents studied in the course though this should be a detailed study. Special Subject essays were often not much more detailed or able to use source material than essays in the Outlines papers. Though specified as a requirement in the question, many responses did not offer a judgement and or an explanation of the different factors relating to the question. Awareness of primary evidence would increase the depth of essay answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Answers were mostly able to make comparisons between the documents and understood the different perspectives of Charles and the London Apprentices, but many answers were quite generalised and failed to observe points such as Charles' blaming of protests on a small group of the lower sort, which is what the Apprentices arguably were. Many answers referred to the dates and the authors' perspective to explain the differences, and some put it into the wider context of late 1641 though some responses discussed this in far too much detail. Some candidates lost the focus on the question and looked at more general points such as religious policy and the difficulties between Charles and his subjects, rather than writing specifically about the relationship between the King and the Londoners.
- (b) Candidates were typically able to use the whole range of documents in their answer and take into account their provenance to support their answer, such as Document D's testimony from William Laud which recognises the strong religious differences from a pro-Charles perspective, and Document E being written in the following decades. Some candidates omitted a document, or failed to develop one fully, and others failed to really deal with the question of how divided England was in 1641, with many giving more general responses discussing the reason for the outbreak of conflict in 1642.

Question 2

Candidates showed strong knowledge of the period of Charles' Personal Rule and only a few discussed events after 1640. There was a good awareness of the work of authors like Kevin Sharpe who argued that the period of Charles' Personal Rule was a time of prosperity that saw his popularity rise to high levels, and criticised the older Whig view of the 11 Years of Tyranny. Hampden and the Ship Money incident was used by most to illustrate opposition. The majority of candidates did not focus directly on 'how great was the opposition', but talked more generally so their answers lost some analytical directness.

Question 3

Candidates demonstrated good understanding for the ultimate Royalist defeat in the Civil War, and the failure to recapture London in 1643 was seen by many as a turning point. Others argued it was the defeats of 1644 and 1645 which were more important, as well as the parliamentary reforms under Cromwell. Some candidates did not consider fully the issue of 1643. Several candidates believed that Edgehill was fought in 1643 rather than 1642 which led to a large discussion that was not strictly relevant to the question.

Question 4

This question was less popular but there were some good answers which offered a supported judgement, rather than merely explaining why there were tensions. There was some confident handling of issues such as arrears in pay and religious differences with some seeing Parliament as being unreasonable and unsympathetic, and some seeing the Army as becoming too radicalised. Answers might have been strengthened by some reference to the contemporary documentation on this issue.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/56
Special Subject:
The French Revolution, 1774–1794

Key messages

- In **question 1(a)**, use evidence from the passages to support your comparisons and contrasts.
- In **question 1(b)**, use your knowledge of the context.
- Remember to give a judgement if the question asks for it.
- Use documents to support your analysis where possible.

General comments

There was some good understanding of the documents shown.

In **Question 1(a)**, there were some quite generalised comments on how the two documents did not support each other. References were made to the nature and context of the documents, but not always used to explain similarity and/or difference.

Most answers to **Question 1(b)** were firmly focused on the documents rather than merely referencing the texts. However, it is important when offering analysis of similarities and differences that the documents are used to support comparisons and contrasts and that their contents are examined closely. There was often a good interpretation of aspects of the documents, but some answers considered the texts as a whole and some more than others. The requirement for the use of contextual knowledge was not always met. Some answers relied too heavily on just explaining the documents without assessing them enough by the application of contextual knowledge. Opportunities to consider the purpose and nature of the documents were not always taken.

There are three requirements for candidates tackling **Question 1(b)**. The first is to interpret the documents in the light of the issue in the question, and thus identify how they might be used in response to the understanding of that issue and to make a judgement about the issue. The second is to consider the interpretation identified in the light of contextual knowledge which might confirm or challenge the evidence in the documents. Therefore, if a document appears to offer evidence that Communist success depended on military power, does that seem convincing in the light of what is known of the context of the period? The third requirement is to look at the nature of the evidence and to take into account various elements concerning provenance which might affect a decision on how well the document offers evidence for a particular view about the issue in the question. This will depend a lot on contextual understanding. There is a requirement in the question that candidates use contextual knowledge. If candidates rely just on the use of documents, they will not be able to gain full marks in the higher band marks. There is also a requirement to treat the documents as a set and so offer an overall review of the interpretations. Linking those which offer complementary evidence is a sound way of demonstrating this requirement, but each document must be treated fully and its evidence assessed. Therefore, answers should not be essays which use extracts from the texts, but rather they should be fully focused on the documents themselves in keeping with the nature of the first part of the paper which is document based.

In **Section B**, overall the responses often showed good understanding of the issues involved and were related to the issues raised in the questions. Many responses were well informed and relevant, but few candidates made much use of any documents studied in the course though this should be a detailed study. Special Subject essays were often not much more detailed or able to use source material than essays in the Outlines papers. Though specified as a requirement in the question, many responses did not offer a judgement and or an explanation of the different factors relating to the question. Awareness of primary evidence would increase the depth of essay answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Answers usually identified how both documents supported privilege and argued that this was representative of stability and so changing the position would have constitutional consequences. Few answers explained the common justifications for privilege reflecting the different responsibilities of the three Estates. Answers also usually identified the different attitudes in Document C and Document A towards taxation, though the different focus on aspects of privilege in both documents was not fully explained. Some answers made observations on the significance of the date, but few explained why this may have affected the documents. Some answers did not focus strictly on the issue of privilege and were more generalised in terms of attitudes to taxation.
- (b) Answers generally used most of the documents, especially Document D and Document E in their arguments, and constructed answers that agreed and disagreed with the statement in the question. Several answers neglected one or two documents, usually Document A or Document C, where one was used instead of the other. The issue of the selfish nobility saw Document A and Document C used to support the statement, while Document D was used for a counter-argument, with qualifications regarding how far this was an exceptional example. Most answers did not develop the provenance of Document A and Document C, but many dealt with Document D being printed in America, though far fewer actually managed to make telling comments about how the provenance of Document D actually strengthened or weakened their arguments. When it came to the weak king, Document E was usually cited in favour while Document B was used against, with some comment on whether Marie Antoinette was a reliable witness, though a few candidates misread the rubric and believed that the letter was written by Joseph II. The use of Document E was variable in quality, with some candidates failing to understand the point about autocracy needing a strong leader to function and not being compatible with liberal ideas, and making more general points about Louis' personal failings. On the whole, there was not a large amount of contextual knowledge, especially about Louis' weak responses before 1789.

Question 2

Responses showed good knowledge about why the Constitution of 1791 failed, with some developed discussion on the King's lack of enthusiasm, and the lack of trust in the monarchy's good faith which was compounded by the fateful flight to Varennes. The Constitution was also criticised in the way that it was overly elaborate and that its franchise was too limited. There was also discussion of how the radicalism which was unleashed by the events of 1789 was impossible to contain. Some answers also assessed the strengths of the Constitution and the impact that the outbreak of war had on the situation, but few answers focused on the central issue of whether the Constitution could have survived if it were not for the destructive and radicalising effect of the invasion by Prussia and Austria in 1792.

Question 3

Answers to this question gave a range of factors such as: the economic, social and political tensions that had been building up over the previous decades; the significance of the high bread prices; the expectations and disillusion caused by the calling of the Estates General in 1789; and, the belief that the King was unwilling to grant concessions. The better answers focused on events after 1789 and discussed the later effects of the Revolution in terms of increasingly radical sentiment, encouraged by continuing food shortages, and the effects of the outbreak of war in 1792. Few candidates made clear distinctions between rural areas and Paris when explaining the nature and scale of social upheaval.

Question 4

This question was popular and there were some very detailed and perceptive analyses. Most answers focused mainly on Robespierre's mistakes in terms of: his alienating of key groups such as the Sans Culottes; the divisive nature of his Cult of the Supreme Being; and, the way that he alienated his allies on the Committee for Public Safety by accusing them of treason and so forcing them to act before he could act against them. Several essays also explored the weariness for the Terror and how Robespierre had gone too far by maintaining it at the time when the social and economic consequences of war had begun to lessen their impact on France. Most sought to blame Robespierre for his downfall, but there were some more balanced views.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/57
Special Subject: Gladstone and
Disraeli, 1867–1886

Key messages

- In **question 1(a)**, use evidence from the passages to support your comparisons and contrasts.
- In **question 1(b)**, use your knowledge of the context.
- Remember to give a judgement if the question asks for it.
- Use documents to support your analysis where possible.

General comments

There was some good understanding of the documents shown.

In **Question 1(a)**, there were some quite generalised comments on how the two documents did not did support each other. References were made to the nature and context of the documents, but not always used to explain similarity and/or difference.

Most answers to **Question 1(b)** were firmly focused on the documents rather than merely referencing the texts. However, it is important when offering analysis of similarities and differences that the documents are used to support comparisons and contrasts and that their contents are examined closely. There was often a good interpretation of aspects of the documents, but some answers considered the texts as a whole and some more than others. The requirement for the use of contextual knowledge was not always met. Some answers relied too heavily on just explaining the documents without assessing them enough by the application of contextual knowledge. Opportunities to consider the purpose and nature of the documents were not always taken.

There are three requirements for candidates tackling **Question 1(b)**. The first is to interpret the documents in the light of the issue in the question, and thus identify how they might be used in response to the understanding of that issue and to make a judgement about the issue. The second is to consider the interpretation identified in the light of contextual knowledge which might confirm or challenge the evidence in the documents. Therefore, if a document appears to offer evidence that Communist success depended on military power, does that seem convincing in the light of what is known of the context of the period? The third requirement is to look at the nature of the evidence and to take into account various elements concerning provenance which might affect a decision on how well the document offers evidence for a particular view about the issue in the question. This will depend a lot on contextual understanding. There is a requirement in the question that candidates use contextual knowledge. If candidates rely just on the use of documents, they will not be able gain full marks in the higher band marks. There is also a requirement to treat the documents as a set and so offer an overall review of the interpretations. Linking those which offer complementary evidence is a sound way of demonstrating this requirement, but each document must be treated fully and its evidence assessed. Therefore, answers should not be essays which use extracts from the texts, but rather they should be fully focused on the documents themselves in keeping with the nature of the first part of the paper which is document based.

In **Section B**, overall the responses often showed good understanding of the issues involved and were related to the issues raised in the questions. Many responses were well informed and relevant, but few candidates made much use of any documents studied in the course though this should be a detailed study. Special Subject essays were often not much more detailed or able to use source material than essays in the Outlines papers. Though specified as a requirement in the question, many responses did not offer a judgement and or an explanation of the different factors relating to the question. Awareness of primary evidence would increase the depth of essay answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) The best responses were those that drew inferences from the text of the two documents, as explicit similarities and differences were relatively few (e.g. Victoria's support for parliamentary reform, her implied support for Conservative ministers, which could be verified from own knowledge very easily). The differences were largely based around the provenance which was not realised by many candidates. Disraeli's comments are very much from a party political perspective along with his well-known habit of flattering Victoria. Document B was written by a palace servant (albeit the Queen's Private Secretary) and, as such, was more circumspect and discreet. Most responses, however, agreed that the two documents corroborated each other as to where the Queen's political sympathies lay. Knowledge was limited but good, though weaker responses were characterised by much paraphrase of the documents.
- (b) Few responses saw the main objective of Derby, Disraeli and the Conservatives as being to 'increase the loyalty and contentment of a great portion of Her Majesty's subjects'. Most saw it as a ploy to improve Conservative standing, to 'dish the Whigs' or for Disraeli to trick Gladstone. Some responses clearly took the question literally and looked for references to Derby's comment in every document, underlying the importance of drawing inferences from documents as well considering the specific references. The best responses used their knowledge of the events surrounding the passage of the Reform Bill, and its contents, to test the documents, especially the first four documents. A knowledge of the terms of the Act as it was passed could inform which 'great portion of the Queen's subjects' did benefit from it, and an understanding of the how the Bill was passed could show to what extent the outcomes were what the government had intended.

Question 2

The best responses identified or defined Gladstonian Liberalism at outset to provide a context for the rest of the response. Without this, responses tended to lack a clear structure and a considered judgement was difficult. Again, better responses also identified areas where different parts of the party opposed Gladstone and provided specific evidence to support why and/or how opposition manifested itself and from whom. Without clear understanding of what Gladstonian Liberalism was, the responses tended to become a list of what he did and whom he offended.

Question 3

The best responses considered both aspects of the question. They often reached the conclusion that the domestic programme was, in fact, quite 'adventurous' but, because it was so largely permissive, it was fairly limited in achievement. Thus, it was important for candidates to define what they understood by 'unadventurous' and 'limited' in this context. Many responses, and often the better ones, grouped legislation by type and briefly indicated how it was, for example, an improvement on Liberal reforms from the previous administration, before summarising its impact. Responses were more effective in discussing the limitations of acts such as the Artisans' Dwellings Act or the Sale of Food and Drugs Act rather than why such legislation might, or might not, be regarded as 'adventurous'.

Question 4

The better responses were careful to identify some of Gladstone's underlying principles for his foreign policy (e.g. morality and protection of Christianity; prevention of European monopoly of African trade) and then attempted to apply these to Africa. Responses were less effective when they merely described what Gladstone's ministry did in respect of Africa and least effective when comparisons with Disraeli led to descriptions of Disraeli's foreign and Imperial activities in Africa.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/58

Special Subject: Russia in Revolution,
1905–1924

Key messages

- In **question 1(a)**, use evidence from the passages to support your comparisons and contrasts.
- In **question 1(b)**, use your knowledge of the context.
- Remember to give a judgement if the question asks for it.
- Use documents to support your analysis where possible.

General comments

There was some good understanding of the documents shown.

In **Question 1(a)**, there were some quite generalised comments on how the two documents did not did support each other. References were made to the nature and context of the documents, but not always used to explain similarity and/or difference.

Most answers to **Question 1(b)** were firmly focused on the documents rather than merely referencing the texts. However, it is important when offering analysis of similarities and differences that the documents are used to support comparisons and contrasts and that their contents are examined closely. There was often a good interpretation of aspects of the documents, but some answers considered the texts as a whole and some more than others. The requirement for the use of contextual knowledge was not always met. Some answers relied too heavily on just explaining the documents without assessing them enough by the application of contextual knowledge. Opportunities to consider the purpose and nature of the documents were not always taken.

There are three requirements for candidates tackling **Question 1(b)**. The first is to interpret the documents in the light of the issue in the question, and thus identify how they might be used in response to the understanding of that issue and to make a judgement about the issue. The second is to consider the interpretation identified in the light of contextual knowledge which might confirm or challenge the evidence in the documents. Therefore, if a document appears to offer evidence that Communist success depended on military power, does that seem convincing in the light of what is known of the context of the period? The third requirement is to look at the nature of the evidence and to take into account various elements concerning provenance which might affect a decision on how well the document offers evidence for a particular view about the issue in the question. This will depend a lot on contextual understanding. There is a requirement in the question that candidates use contextual knowledge. If candidates rely just on the use of documents, they will not be able gain full marks in the higher band marks. There is also a requirement to treat the documents as a set and so offer an overall review of the interpretations. Linking those which offer complementary evidence is a sound way of demonstrating this requirement, but each document must be treated fully and its evidence assessed. Therefore, answers should not be essays which use extracts from the texts, but rather they should be fully focused on the documents themselves in keeping with the nature of the first part of the paper which is document based.

In **Section B**, overall the responses often showed good understanding of the issues involved and were related to the issues raised in the questions. Many responses were well informed and relevant, but few candidates made much use of any documents studied in the course though this should be a detailed study. Special Subject essays were often not much more detailed or able to use source material than essays in the Outlines papers. Though specified as a requirement in the question, many responses did not offer a judgement and or an explanation of the different factors relating to the question. Awareness of primary evidence would increase the depth of essay answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) There were many successful answers which were able to see that as well as differences, the two documents contained similarities and the Tsar was not rescinding all the concessions made earlier. Many attempted to show what had changed between the issuing of Document A and the issuing of Document B, but the explanation of the differences could sometimes have been sharper and more developed. Better answers displayed a careful reading and use of the wording of the two documents, while less successful answers made more generalised contrasts and some drifted too far from the texts into a history of the period.
- (b) Most answers linked the documents to the issue in the question but, in some cases, the consideration of each of the documents was uneven. Stronger answers fully considered the documents and used their knowledge to challenge or reinforce the implications of the texts. They also commented on the provenance of the documents and noted the circumstances in which they were produced. Less successful answers wrote an essay on the post 1905 changes using parts of the documents as references to support their points. Some answers neglected Document D and Document E, and offered more on the Dumas and the constitutional concessions. Some answers, rather than focusing on the whole of the document, gave the single comment that Stolypin had failed for Document D and gave sketchy consideration for Document E. Comments that Document E was more or less useful than the other documents because it offered secondary evidence gained no credit. However, there were some useful analyses of the origins of the other documents.

Question 2

Most answers showed knowledge about why the revolutions occurred and used this to answer the question. Better answers considered the demands of this question and responded well, dealing with both revolutions and focusing on the key issue of resistance. Less successful answers were less balanced and tended to see the question as being focused on factors which brought about the revolutions. Thus, there were many explanations of the impact of war on the February Revolution and the inadequacies of Kerensky in October. The nature of the revolutions as in the suddenness of the demonstrations, the reluctance of the particular troops in the capital, the splits and demoralisation among the authorities, and so on, tended not to be well analysed. Weaker answers did not fully explain the nature of the October Revolution or focus on who might have resisted and why they did not.

Question 3

There was sound knowledge of many reasons why the Bolsheviks won and most dealt in some measure with 'the ruthlessness'. Better answers assessed 'ruthlessness' at the start of their essays, and described how it could be counterproductive and that the Reds did not have a monopoly on it. Weaker answers considered many other factors before turning their attention to the focus of the question, 'ruthlessness'.

Question 4

This was a less popular question but answers analysed the situation which Lenin faced by 1921 with some acuity. The debate between those who saw Lenin simply responding to circumstances and betraying key principles of socialism, and Lenin's own defence of the need to establish the conditions for a full socialist state by allowing a measure of capitalist development, was not often analysed. However, there were some strong explanations and some offered some discrimination between the different possible causes.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/59
Special Subject: Germany, 1919–1945

Key messages

- In **question 1(a)**, use evidence from the passages to support your comparisons and contrasts.
- In **question 1(b)**, use your knowledge of the context.
- Remember to give a judgement if the question asks for it.
- Use documents to support your analysis where possible.

General comments

There was some good understanding of the documents shown.

In **Question 1(a)**, there were some quite generalised comments on how the two documents did not did support each other. References were made to the nature and context of the documents, but not always used to explain similarity and/or difference.

Most answers to **Question 1(b)** were firmly focused on the documents rather than merely referencing the texts. However, it is important when offering analysis of similarities and differences that the documents are used to support comparisons and contrasts and that their contents are examined closely. There was often a good interpretation of aspects of the documents, but some answers considered the texts as a whole and some more than others. The requirement for the use of contextual knowledge was not always met. Some answers relied too heavily on just explaining the documents without assessing them enough by the application of contextual knowledge. Opportunities to consider the purpose and nature of the documents were not always taken.

There are three requirements for candidates tackling **Question 1(b)**. The first is to interpret the documents in the light of the issue in the question, and thus identify how they might be used in response to the understanding of that issue and to make a judgement about the issue. The second is to consider the interpretation identified in the light of contextual knowledge which might confirm or challenge the evidence in the documents. Therefore, if a document appears to offer evidence that Communist success depended on military power, does that seem convincing in the light of what is known of the context of the period? The third requirement is to look at the nature of the evidence and to take into account various elements concerning provenance which might affect a decision on how well the document offers evidence for a particular view about the issue in the question. This will depend a lot on contextual understanding. There is a requirement in the question that candidates use contextual knowledge. If candidates rely just on the use of documents, they will not be able gain full marks in the higher band marks. There is also a requirement to treat the documents as a set and so offer an overall review of the interpretations. Linking those which offer complementary evidence is a sound way of demonstrating this requirement, but each document must be treated fully and its evidence assessed. Therefore, answers should not be essays which use extracts from the texts, but rather they should be fully focused on the documents themselves in keeping with the nature of the first part of the paper which is document based.

In **Section B**, overall the responses often showed good understanding of the issues involved and were related to the issues raised in the questions. Many responses were well informed and relevant, but few candidates made much use of any documents studied in the course though this should be a detailed study. Special Subject essays were often not much more detailed or able to use source material than essays in the Outlines papers. Though specified as a requirement in the question, many responses did not offer a judgement and or an explanation of the different factors relating to the question. Awareness of primary evidence would increase the depth of essay answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) The better responses worked thematically, quoting from each document briefly and gave some indication why they disagreed, not just how. Some responses used Document B to challenge Document A and tended to lose the focus of the question. The key points on which the documents differed were: the issues about von Papen and his likely handling of Hitler as Vice-Chancellor; the question of the legal versus illegal challenge for power, and why Hitler chose the latter; and, the issue about how the SA/SS might fare against the Wehrmacht and the police. Good contextual knowledge helped explain the differences, but the better responses kept the focus firmly on the documents' content rather than describing how Hitler finally came to power. Such contextual knowledge included: the different political positions of Strasser and Hitler within the Nazi party; the past failure of the illegal approach; and, the fact that the SA/SS were 'in the background' as a potential threat though never used by Hitler.
- (b) The best responses clearly identified, from the start, those documents that were for or against the interpretation and those that could be used either way. The key arguments were either Hitler was fortunate and depended on the national situation (Document E) and the work of others (Document C and, implicitly, Document A); or, it was his skill (Document B, Document C and Document E) along with the support he had created (Document D). The amount of own knowledge was not critical, but needed to be relevant and to support one argument or the other. The evaluation of the documents by the better responses was by using that knowledge to question or support what the documents said, rather than giving a formulaic response such as 'Strasser was an enemy and therefore cannot be trusted' (Document A), or Hitler would not criticise himself (Document B). These better responses provided references to, for example, the role of von Papen or Hitler's political judgement, or gave details of the economic situation to support Document E. Finally, all responses needed to conclude with some form of judgement, and the best responses based this on a combination of the documents and contextual knowledge.

Question 2

In order to create an effective response, it was important to define what was meant by 'a weak dictator' in the context of this question. This question was not necessarily requiring an historiographical response, but some awareness of the argument around the structuralist or intentionalist interpretations was expected. The best responses addressed this question of governance directly and were able to cite examples of the apparent 'divide and rule' strategy Hitler adopted. (e.g. Göring and the Office of the Four-Year plan as opposed to Schacht as Economics Minister). Such responses also tended to identify those areas that Hitler retained to himself for all decisions (e.g. foreign policy). Other, less effective responses, tended to focus entirely on the steps by which Nazi control was established within the single-party state. The judgement needed a clear conclusion as to whether the terms 'a weak dictator' was appropriate and what the determining factor was.

Question 3

For this question an analytical approach characterised the best responses. These reviewed the work of Schacht, Göring and Speer against the changing needs of the German economy over time. While this produced a slightly chronological answer, it also allowed for evaluation of relative success. Better responses also used detailed and specific factual information (e.g. figures concerning production, employment) as part of that analysis. Consideration was also given to those areas where there may have been 'doctored' figures or where other policies (e.g. the role of the RAD, the changing attitudes to women in the workplace, the treatment of Jews before the most severe discrimination) may have concealed harsh truths about successes.

Question 4

The best responses began by establishing the range of possible explanations in their introduction (anti-Semitism and long term policies; cumulative radicalisation and working towards the Führer; de-sensitisation of the people; the impact of the War and the increase in the numbers of Jews under Reich control; the end of opportunities to enforce emigration). Given the number of possibilities, this initial outlining was important to structure the response. The best responses maintained a very tightly organised structure throughout their essay. Most responses had a clear idea where the 'best explanation' lay and saw the War as the defining factor, while other explanations were considered and rejected. The final judgements almost invariably explained why that judgement had been reached and why one explanation was, indeed, better than any others.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9769/06 Personal Investigation</p>

General comments

From most Centres, there was an interesting range of Personal Investigations, though some schools seem to be restricting the choice within their school. The stronger Personal Investigations benefited from the preparation and completion of a thorough and carefully constructed question and proposal.

This year's Personal Investigation produced a fascinating range of historical topics. While the candidates are marked exclusively on their essay, the planning stages are vital for a successful investigation. For the most part, the proposals were reasonably thorough and candidates had addressed the various recommendations of the Chief Examiners (especially regarding the phrasing of questions). Candidates and Supervisors are advised to pay close attention to the feedback given by the reviewers about the proposals, and whether this relates to the modification of a question or the recommendation of additional (often more recent) literature. Candidates who did not incorporate this advice tended to produce less effective essays. (The proposal forms must be attached to the final piece.)

The more successful Personal Investigations presented a clear and concise introduction which addressed the precise demands of the question directly. Less effective were the scene-setting contextual paragraphs that were predominantly descriptive. Some candidates favoured a historiographical review in their introductions which often were not linked explicitly to the question under investigation and tended to be descriptive.

Structurally, the stronger essays were those with paragraphs that presented a more thematic approach. Equally significant is how candidates introduce and interpret their sources. Candidates often presented lengthy historians' quotations which were not integrated within their arguments, and sometimes they relied heavily on a single source. Also, though there was evidence of much careful research, candidates at times underperformed through a lack of attention to the assessment criteria.

Conclusions provide an invaluable, final opportunity to present the most persuasive arguments, but sometimes these were not present. Some candidates exceeded the word limit which meant that some conclusions could not be included within the marking.

The finest essays were those that thoroughly digested the literature and offered their own approach to the material and the argument. There were some topics that were well-researched, for example: Japanese foreign policy; women in the fifteenth century; the impact of Marian persecution; a range of crusades; and some American political history. The key to success may be candidate's enthusiasm for the topic, which is often overwhelmingly present in the more esoteric choices.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/71
Special Subject: China under
Mao Zedong, 1949–1976

Key messages

- In **question 1(a)**, use evidence from the passages to support your comparisons and contrasts.
- In **question 1(b)**, use your knowledge of the context.
- Remember to give a judgement if the question asks for it.
- Use documents to support your analysis where possible.

General comments

There was some good understanding of the documents shown.

In **Question 1(a)**, there were some quite generalised comments on how the two documents did not did support each other. References were made to the nature and context of the documents, but not always used to explain similarity and/or difference.

Most answers to **Question 1(b)** were firmly focused on the documents rather than merely referencing the texts. However, it is important when offering analysis of similarities and differences that the documents are used to support comparisons and contrasts and that their contents are examined closely. There was often a good interpretation of aspects of the documents, but some answers considered the texts as a whole and some more than others. The requirement for the use of contextual knowledge was not always met. Some answers relied too heavily on just explaining the documents without assessing them enough by the application of contextual knowledge. Opportunities to consider the purpose and nature of the documents were not always taken.

There are three requirements for candidates tackling **Question 1(b)**. The first is to interpret the documents in the light of the issue in the question, and thus identify how they might be used in response to the understanding of that issue and to make a judgement about the issue. The second is to consider the interpretation identified in the light of contextual knowledge which might confirm or challenge the evidence in the documents. Therefore, if a document appears to offer evidence that Communist success depended on military power, does that seem convincing in the light of what is known of the context of the period? The third requirement is to look at the nature of the evidence and to take into account various elements concerning provenance which might affect a decision on how well the document offers evidence for a particular view about the issue in the question. This will depend a lot on contextual understanding. There is a requirement in the question that candidates use contextual knowledge. If candidates rely just on the use of documents, they will not be able gain full marks in the higher band marks. There is also a requirement to treat the documents as a set and so offer an overall review of the interpretations. Linking those which offer complementary evidence is a sound way of demonstrating this requirement, but each document must be treated fully and its evidence assessed. Therefore, answers should not be essays which use extracts from the texts, but rather they should be fully focused on the documents themselves in keeping with the nature of the first part of the paper which is document based.

In **Section B**, overall the responses often showed good understanding of the issues involved and were related to the issues raised in the questions. Many responses were well informed and relevant, but few candidates made much use of any documents studied in the course though this should be a detailed study. Special Subject essays were often not much more detailed or able to use source material than essays in the Outlines papers. Though specified as a requirement in the question, many responses did not offer a judgement and or an explanation of the different factors relating to the question. Awareness of primary evidence would increase the depth of essay answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) There were many effective comparisons made but not all the focus was maintained on the Communists so some answers became more general. Some did not detect the hostility implicit in Document A with Dean Acheson implying that there was a distinct attempt 'to sell' themselves by the Chinese Communist Party, rather than the more favourable view expressed in Document D. However, there were some strong comparisons which were supported by close textual references, and many attempted to consider the origin and nature of the documents. Taking aside limited comments on J F Melby (Document D) being likely to forget because it was a long time ago, some identified the difference between the view of US personnel 'on the spot' and the view from Washington.
- (b) Stronger answers maintained a focus on the difference in the documents between evidence which suggested military factors and evidence which suggested wider elements. In general, the documents were understood but there was some variation in the depth in which they were used, with some qualifications and nuances not always being recognised, especially in Document E. Document A was not always fully treated and weaker responses did not look much further than its famous statement about political power growing 'out of the barrel of a gun'. There were some good interpretations offered for Document B, effectively linking it to Document E and using contextual knowledge. Some candidates supported their arguments about the passages with some relevant contextual knowledge relating to the way the Chinese Communist Party organised its military resistance, and the way it appealed to the people and offered a contrast to the Nationalists, but some based their answers purely on passage analysis.

Question 2

There were strong answers which offered a balanced view, demonstrating in the context of China's problems in 1949 that Communist Rule brought about some much needed change, and attempted an evaluation of the relative importance of the high level of repression and violence, particularly against landlords. Most answers kept within the years specified in the question (1949 and 1956), but some included irrelevant sections dealing with the Great Leap Forward. Some answers offered a balance between the elements but were focused mainly on economic changes. On the whole, the question was understood and few answers relied exclusively on description.

Question 3

Better answers attempted to identify what 'China's real economic needs' were, or were perceived to be by Mao, prior to the Great Leap Forward. Without this approach, answers became a commentary on the reasons for the Great Leap Forward, with weaker responses moving on to analyses of the consequences. Ideology was not always well understood or interpreted narrowly in terms of Mao's desire for political power and control. There was some detailed knowledge of the lead up to the Great Leap Forward and its overall aims but, in general, answers needed a more developed and supported judgement.

Question 4

This was a less popular question and answers tended to be more descriptive than was the case with the other two essay questions. Some answers were focused on lengthy accounts of the Korean War, but there were better answers which looked at disputes particularly with the USSR, putting the dispute in the wider context. The dispute with India was generally dealt with less fully. There was some interesting analysis which looked at the historical roots of the disputes and suggested that continuity with the past may have been more significant than ideology.

HISTORY

Paper 9769/72

Special Subject: The Civil Rights
Movement in the USA, 1954–1980

Key messages

- In **question 1(a)**, use evidence from the passages to support your comparisons and contrasts.
- In **question 1(b)**, use your knowledge of the context.
- Remember to give a judgement if the question asks for it.
- Use documents to support your analysis where possible.

General comments

There was some good understanding of the documents shown.

In **Question 1(a)**, there were some quite generalised comments on how the two documents did not did support each other. References were made to the nature and context of the documents, but not always used to explain similarity and/or difference.

Most answers to **Question 1(b)** were firmly focused on the documents rather than merely referencing the texts. However, it is important when offering analysis of similarities and differences that the documents are used to support comparisons and contrasts and that their contents are examined closely. There was often a good interpretation of aspects of the documents, but some answers considered the texts as a whole and some more than others. The requirement for the use of contextual knowledge was not always met. Some answers relied too heavily on just explaining the documents without assessing them enough by the application of contextual knowledge. Opportunities to consider the purpose and nature of the documents were not always taken.

There are three requirements for candidates tackling **Question 1(b)**. The first is to interpret the documents in the light of the issue in the question, and thus identify how they might be used in response to the understanding of that issue and to make a judgement about the issue. The second is to consider the interpretation identified in the light of contextual knowledge which might confirm or challenge the evidence in the documents. Therefore, if a document appears to offer evidence that Communist success depended on military power, does that seem convincing in the light of what is known of the context of the period? The third requirement is to look at the nature of the evidence and to take into account various elements concerning provenance which might affect a decision on how well the document offers evidence for a particular view about the issue in the question. This will depend a lot on contextual understanding. There is a requirement in the question that candidates use contextual knowledge. If candidates rely just on the use of documents, they will not be able gain full marks in the higher band marks. There is also a requirement to treat the documents as a set and so offer an overall review of the interpretations. Linking those which offer complementary evidence is a sound way of demonstrating this requirement, but each document must be treated fully and its evidence assessed. Therefore, answers should not be essays which use extracts from the texts, but rather they should be fully focused on the documents themselves in keeping with the nature of the first part of the paper which is document based.

In **Section B**, overall the responses often showed good understanding of the issues involved and were related to the issues raised in the questions. Many responses were well informed and relevant, but few candidates made much use of any documents studied in the course though this should be a detailed study. Special Subject essays were often not much more detailed or able to use source material than essays in the Outlines papers. Though specified as a requirement in the question, many responses did not offer a judgement and or an explanation of the different factors relating to the question. Awareness of primary evidence would increase the depth of essay answers.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Most responses identified the major similarities and differences between the documents sensing that in each case the desire 'to do something' was a key factor. The other main similarity – spontaneity – was clearly identified along with the role of the media in spreading the news. The main differences (place, nature of the direct action, the fact that the black students expected trouble while the white ones in Chicago hardly considered the possibility) were generally identified. Differentiation between the responses was largely by the quality of explanation as to why there are differences, or meaningful comments about provenance and dates, though there were some very formulaic, and incorrect, comments about Document C's reliability.
- (b) The best responses clearly identified the sources that were for or against the interpretation and those that could be used either way. The best grouping for the interpretation that leadership was necessary for direct action was of Document A, Document B and Document E, with Documents C and Document D arguing that such action could be generated quite spontaneously. However, elements of Documents A (Rosa Parks) and Document B (Elizabeth Eckford) could also be used against the interpretation. The roles of the NAACP and CORE (Documents B and Document E, respectively) were clearly identified but so too were the students' spontaneous actions in Documents C and Document D. Better responses evaluated the different documents and the most effective of these were the responses where their own knowledge about, for example the Freedom Rides, was deployed to judge the reliability of the documents. Those that suggested failing memory (Document C) or a desire to make his own contribution seem more significant (Document E) were less convincing.

Question 2

It was important for this question to put the leadership of Malcolm X within a broader context of other black leaders of the movement. While it was expected that Malcolm X would dominate responses, both in terms of what he achieved in his lifetime but also (and equally, if not more, significantly) in terms of the legacy after his death, some reference to Elijah Mohammed, Stokely Carmichael and other leaders was also required.

Question 3

This was the most popular question. The issue for many of the better responses was whether the fact that Johnson passed more legislation than Kennedy in terms of civil rights should outweigh the legacy of Kennedy in terms of a civil rights bill in readiness and a clear commitment to civil rights. Most responses felt that it did, and argued that Kennedy was a latecomer to supporting civil rights, while Johnson's background as a Texas (i.e. Southern) senator was of major significance. The details of each president's administration and their achievements were well described and used to make each case. Some of the responses were too focused on what each did at the expense of considering 'which was the more significant' and these tended to decide in favour of Johnson by sheer volume of legislation. The best responses considered what each man stood for, said and achieved, and based their conclusions on that analysis.

Question 4

The issue here was whether the police or another section of white society (e.g. the KKK, the White Citizens' Councils, Southern Congressmen, institutions such as universities) were the most resistant. The evidence from places like Birmingham and Selma (particularly when it was caught on camera) clearly suggested the police, but the role of the KKK was also very significant in terms of bombings and attacks on groups like the Freedom Riders. The less publicised opposition of the institutions was also significant. Successful responses needed to place these alternatives together and then reach an informed view in terms of 'most resistant'.